4

Trade in Amer: 22.

DOCTOR PRICE's

NOTIONS of the NATURE

OF

CIVIL LIBERTY,

SHEWN TO BE CONTRADICTORY TO

REASON AND SCRIPTURE.

—— England never did and never will lie at the proud foot of a conqueror, but when the firſt does help to wound herſelf. *Shakeſpeare.*

Amicus Plato; ſed magis amica veritas.

LONDON,
Printed for T. BECKET, at the Corner of the ADELPHI, in the STRAND.
MDCCLXXVII.

TO

THOSE MEMBERS

OF THE

COMMON COUNCIL OF LONDON,

WHO HAVE DECLARED THEMSELVES

THE PATRONS OF

IRRELIGION AND SEDITION,

THE FOLLOWING DISCOURSE

IS EARNESTLY ADDRESSED

BY

THE AUTHOR,

JOHN GRAY.

DOCTOR PRICE's

NOTIONS OF THE NATURE OF

CIVIL LIBERTY,

SHEWN TO BE CONTRADICTORY TO

REASON AND SCRIPTURE.

DOCTOR PRICE begins his obſervations on the Nature of Civil Liberty, by telling his readers, "That our Colonies in "America appear to be now determined to "do and ſuffer every thing, under the perſua-"ſion that Great Britain is attempting to rob "them of that liberty, to which every member "of ſociety, and all civil communities, have "a natural and unalienable right." The whole purport of the Doctor's pamphlet is to prove, that this *perſuaſion* is well grounded; and therefore that the war on the part of the Colonies is a juſt war, and iniquitous on the part of government. But how does he attempt

to prove that? By arguments founded on ſophiſtry; by ignorant miſrepreſentation, and ſeditious declamation. The Doctor confeſſes that moſt of his arguments are not new; and moſt aſſuredly they are not; for many of the propoſitions he advances have been produced and refuted three or four times over within theſe few years paſt. But as he has again brought them into the field, and marſhalled them in one body, with ſome reinforcements of his own, he may, perhaps, vainly flatter himſelf that they have acquired ſuch ſtrength as to be irreſiſtible. Let us therefore examine them by the ſtandard of truth, of reaſon, of ſcripture, and of the principles of the conſtitution. If they be found not to accord with any of theſe, my readers will eaſily judge what value to ſet upon them, and will perceive that the *perſuaſion*, which he thinks well grounded, is altogether a groundleſs and falſe *perſuaſion*, that can only harbour in the breaſts of the ignorant or factious.

The Doctor opens his diſcourſe with a few definitions of different kinds of liberty, namely, of *phyſical*, *moral*, *religious*, and *civil liberty*, the laſt of which only appears to have any reference to the diſpute about the ſubmiſſion of coloniſts to the ſupreme legiſlature of the ſtate, of which they are members. I ſay appears; for upon a ſtrict examination of what he calls Civil Liberty, we ſhall find it to mean either the legiſlative independence of one ſtate in reſpect to another, or elſe a moſt crude indiſtinct notion of a ſtate of

ſociety

ſociety that has no where any exiſtence. Firſt, "Civil Liberty, according to his definition, "is the power of a civil ſociety, community, "or ſtate, to govern itſelf by its own diſcretion, "or by laws of its own making, without being "ſubject to any foreign diſcretion, or to the "impoſitions of any extraneous will or power." This is his firſt definition of Civil Liberty, in pages third and fourth, in which, with the utmoſt inaccuracy, he leaves it entirely to be gueſſed at what he means by *foreign diſcretion*, and whether the terms *civil ſociety*, *community*, and *ſtate* ſtand as ſynonimous, or are to be taken in a disjunctive ſenſe; for though every ſtate is a civil ſociety, every ſociety or community is not a ſtate. Thus far however it would ſeem that by Civil Liberty, the Doctor means the *legiſlative independence* of one ſtate upon another; and in this ſenſe I affirm the conſideration of it has nothing at all to do with the ſubmiſſion of coloniſts to the ſupreme legiſlature of their parent ſtate. But mark the jeſuitical ſophiſtry of the Doctor. Throughout the reſt of his performance, he drops this firſt ſenſe of the term Civil Liberty, and wherever there is any reference to it, he always implies by it, the legiſlative independence of individuals in reſpect to each other, which is altogether incompatible with every ſtate of civil ſociety. Thus, he tells us, that without Civil Liberty, man is a "*poor*, "*abject* animal, without *rights*," which cannot poſſibly have any reſpect to his firſt definition of

Civil Liberty. Again, he ſays, "In every "free ſtate every man is his own legiſlator. All "laws are particular proviſions eſtabliſhed by "*common conſent*. If the laws are not made by "common conſent, a government by them does "not differ from ſlavery," &c. &c.

The Doctor ſeems highly ſatisfied with his accurate definitions, which he wiſhes his readers to pay great attention to, and then riſes into a declamatory rant in praiſe of Dear Liberty, "according to the repreſentation he has made "of it." Now it already plainly appears that his *repreſentation of it*, is remarkable for nothing but inaccuracy and abſurdity, and that however dogmatically he undertakes to explain it to others, he himſelf has nothing but the moſt blundering notions about it; for in the ſpace of two pages we have Civil Liberty declared to be two different things; firſt, the legiſlative independence of one ſtate upon another, and then the legiſlative independence of the individuals of a ſociety in reſpect to each other, which laſt is abſolute nonſenſe, and exiſts no where upon earth.

So much for the inaccuracy of the Doctor's definitions of Civil Liberty. His wonderful abſurdity and confuſion of ideas will be ſtill more apparent, when we conſider the inaccuracy of his general diviſion of liberty. He begins his firſt ſection with telling us, that in order to obtain a more diſtinct and accurate view of Liberty as ſuch, it will be uſeful to conſider it under

under the four following diviſions: firſt, Phyſical Liberty.—Secondly, Moral Liberty.—Thirdly, Religious Liberty, and—Fourthly, Civil Liberty. Now with the ſame propriety he might have made a general diviſion of liberty, conſiſting of ten, of fifteen, or of twenty different heads; for when one is ſo ignorant as to arrange things of a different nature under the ſame claſs, he needs not much confine himſelf in his enumeration. That the Doctor has been ſo ignorant will appear by his own definitions. His three firſt definitions of Liberty regard man as an individual; when, all at once, he takes a leap to a fourth definition, which has nothing to do with the Liberty of the individual, but regards only the independence of one community upon another. With the ſame propriety, when explaining the nature of iron, he might leap to the explanation of the nature of a clock, becauſe it is compoſed of pieces of iron. With the ſame propriety an architect in ſpecifying the kinds of ſtones uſed in London, might tell us there are four kinds, namely, granite, Portland ſtone, Purbeck ſtone, and a church, which is compoſed of ſtones; or a cabinet-maker might enumerate the kinds of wood he was in poſſeſſion of, by ſaying that he had in his ſhop four kinds, oak, aſh, elm, and a cheſt of drawers.

The perplexing obſcurity of Doctor Price, and his vain parade of ſcience, may create admiration in the ignorant, but they vaniſh at once in conſidering Liberty in regard to man, as

an

an individual, under the three following general heads, namely, Phyſical Liberty, Religious Liberty, and Natural Liberty. The two firſt, that is, *Phyſical* and *Religious Liberty*, are for ever inalienable to man. But the laſt, or *Natural Liberty*, ſo far from being inalienable, is actually reſigned up, or alienated by every man, the moment he becomes a member of civil ſociety. *Qui civis fit*, according to Puffendorf, *libertatis naturalis jacturam facit*, the literal tranſlation of which is, Whoever enters into civil ſociety, throws his *Natural Liberty* overboard. That is to ſay, ſhould a law be made in ſociety, to the enacting of which the individual refuſes his conſent, he is nevertheleſs in duty bound to ſubmit to that law, when he has not the majority of the ſtate of his opinion. The caſe is the ſame with three millions of individuals as with one individual, while the majority of the ſtate think differently from them.

Doctor Price, incapable of diſcriminating the various gradations of liberty that ſubſiſt in civilized ſtates, preſumptuouſly talks of having *laid the line* between liberty and ſlavery; and moſt abſurdly deems all thoſe ſlaves, who, in a ſtate of ſociety, do not poſſeſs the ſame freedom of will as in a ſtate of natural liberty, though we have ſeen, that it is only by a renunciation of *natural liberty*, that man can poſſeſs *political liberty*. But I would aſk Doctor Price, is liberty all-white, and ſlavery all-black, that a line may ſo eaſily be laid in the point of tranſition from the one

to

to the other? Is there no *crepuſculæ* or twilight between the enlightened hemiſphere and the darkened? As eaſily may Doctor Price fix the moment when night ends and day begins, as lay the line to determine what is liberty and what is ſlavery. As ſoon might he convince mankind, that there are but two colours in the world, as perſuade them that the tranſition from liberty to ſlavery may be marked by a line, or made at one ſtep. In truth, and in fact, the gradations of liberty, in civilized ſtates, are infinite, like the tints of colours; and it is only the two or three laſt degradations of it, if I may be allowed the expreſſion, that are by the univerſal concurrence of men called ſlavery.

Among the free Romans the liberty of the Patricians was certainly different from that of the Plebeians; the *Jus Romanum* was one thing, and the *Jus Latinum* another; and both theſe differed from the *Jus Italicum*, the *Jus Municipale*, the *Jus Coloniarum*, &c. So likewiſe among the Free Britons, the liberty of the nobility is different from the liberty of the commons; the liberty of the clergy is different from that of the laity; the liberty of the land-holder is different from that of the land-renter. But happy and honourable for Britiſh coloniſts, their liberties are exactly the ſame with thoſe of Britons of the ſame rank and degree, though the caſe was very different with Roman coloniſts, who had neither the *jus ſuffragiorum* nor

the

the *jus honorum*, that is, they could neither *elect* nor be *elected* into public offices of the ſtate.

Doctor Price, in preſumptuouſly taking upon him *to lay the line* between liberty and ſlavery, does not bluſh to differ in opinion from St. Paul, who, though he ſtood on the ſide of the Doctor's line marked for ſlavery, boldly declares himſelf a FREEMAN FREEBORN; and very juſtly he might; for as a *Roman*, not as a *Jew*, his liberty was very great, and he inherited many diſtinguiſhing privileges; though, had he lived in the times of the republic, he could not have borne any public office in the ſtate. In like manner, before the preſent diſturbances in America, there was not a Britiſh ſubject on that continent, but might as a *Briton*, not as an *American*, have declared that he was a FREEMAN FREEBORN, with this diſtinguiſhing advantage, in preference to a Roman coloniſt, that all the offices of ſtate were acceſſible to him.

It is none of the ſmalleſt abſurdities of the Doctor, in this firſt ſection, that he has preſumed to be an innovator in the Engliſh language, as well as in the fundamental principles of government. Before Doctor Price's days, the term Civil Liberty always implied the degree of relative liberty, which men enjoyed in a ſtate of ſociety under whatever form of government they lived. But it is altogether new, and may, I think, be termed an abuſe of language to underſtand by Civil Liberty, the legiſlative independence of one ſtate in reſpect to another.

The

The term *Civil War* has ever been underſtood as meaning the war of fellow-citizens with each other; but for the future, if we reaſon by analogy from Dr. Price's definition, *Civil War* muſt mean the war of one ſtate againſt another. What a wonderful improvement of language!

Upon reading the Doctor's title page, anouncing Obſervations on Civil Liberty, I expected to find in his performance a juſt and well arranged compariſon of the liberty enjoyed by ſubjects under the Britiſh form of government, with the liberty which ſubjects are allowed under other forms of government, commonly called free governments. I expected to find the moſt perfect degree of *Civil Liberty* declared to be that, where, by wiſe laws, the leaſt abridgment was made of *Natural Liberty*, in regard to the three eſſential points of *freedom of perſon*, *freedom of property*, and *freedom of ſpeech*. I expected to find the warmeſt encomiums beſtowed upon the Britiſh conſtitution, for a ſacred regard to thoſe three branches of Liberty; with a remark, that the blaſted tree of Liberty raiſed by the rebels bore no ſuch branches. What then was my ſurprize, to find Dr. Price declaring Civil Liberty to be legiſlative independence! and that the freedom and happineſs of a community conſiſted in being ſelf-governed. Who is there in this iſland that would not rather be mildly governed by a law from China, than tyrannized over by a fellow-townſman or a fellow-countryman? and

yet, according to Dr. Price, the will of the majority implies perfect freedom to a community.

But the hiſtory of all ages and nations ſhews us, that where Dr. Price's Civil Liberty has prevailed, both perſonal liberty and liberty of property have often been wanting. Let us but look into the free governments of Greece, of Rome, of Carthage, and even of Great Britain ſome hundreds of years ago, and we find thouſands deprived both of perſonal liberty, and liberty of property, though they were living in the boſom of ſtates enjoying Doctor Price's Civil Liberty. Let us alſo look into the Republics of Holland, of Venice, of Genoa, of Berne, of Geneva, thoſe models of human felicity according to the ideal opinions of ſome politicians, who think that *republic* and *public welfare* are ſynonymous terms. I will venture to affirm that ſuch acts of deſpotiſm are every year committed in the three firſt of thoſe republics by the rulers towards the governed, and ſubmitted to by them, as would be deemed by Britons abſolute ſlavery. As to Berne, who that has the ſlighteſt acquaintance with that republic does not know that it has dependent provinces or bailiages, which are great objects of ambition among the *notables*, and where the bailiffs, and, I might add, *meſdames les bailives*, with revenues from fifty pounds to two hundred, aſſume an almoſt proconſular and prætorian authority, which the Britiſh conſtitution is unacquainted with. As to Geneva, which poſſeſſes a territory not a fifth-

part

part ſo extenſive as the eſtate of the Duke of Northumberland, it enjoys the Doctor's Civil Liberty; but are the liberties of its ſubjects equal to thoſe of Britiſh ſubjects? There is not a Genevois in London but will acknowledge they are not.

This Civil Liberty of Doctor Price is certainly a moſt charming thing for the *rulers*; but we have but too many proofs that it is not always ſo for the *ruled*. Let us ſuppoſe it actually brought to an eſtabliſhment in the rebel colonies, would the coloniſts be more happy, more rich, or more ſecure, than they have experienced themſelves to be as Britiſh ſubjects? If we may form a concluſion from the moſt arbitrary and deſpotic proceedings of the rebellious delegates of Philadelphia, we may declare that they would not. It may however be ſaid, that theſe arbitrary acts are owing to the preſent ſtate of actual war. But are the coloniſts ſo very ſhort-ſighted as not to perceive that they muſt have many ſuch wars to ſuſtain before their legiſlative independence be acknowledged, not only by Great Britain but by the reſt of the world? And even then, after they have ſwallowed ſo many bitter draughts, will they find their conſtitutions mended? Will the individuals find their liberties either more enlarged, or better ſecured? Would they gain any eſſential advantage in regard to liberty, that they have not hitherto enjoyed? How many of the coloniſts may at this moment ſay to Doctor Price, a curſe upon your

Civil Liberty! Give us liberty of property and perſonal liberty; we mean freedom of perſon and freedom of action according to the laws, which we formerly enjoyed. We have not time to trouble ourſelves about who are the law-makers: we wiſh only to live under that government where liberty of property and perſonal liberty are moſt regarded *.

In

* The following extract from the report of the commiſſioners ſent to the colonies by Charles II. a few years after his reſtoration, will ſhew that the bleſſing of all bleſſings, according to Dr. Price, called *Civil Liberty*, is not always ſuch a bleſſing to the ſubject. "They" (that is the rulers among the Maſſachuſets who were aſſuming Dr. Price's Civil Liberty to themſelves) "will "not admit any who is not a member of their church to "communion, nor their children to baptiſme; yet they "will marry their children to thoſe whome they will not "admitt to baptiſme, if they be rich. They did im-"priſon and barbarouſly uſe Mr. Jourdan for baptizing "children, as himſelf complained in his petition to the "commiſſioners. Thoſe whome they will not admitt to "the communion they compell to come to their ſer-"mons by forcing from them five ſhillings for every "neglect; yet theſe men thought their paying one ſhil-"ling for not coming to prayers in England, was an in-"ſupportable tyranny. They have put many Quakers "to death of other provinces, for which alſo they are "petitioned againſt. Firſt they baniſhed them as Quak-"ers upon payn of death; and then executed them for "returning They have beate ſome to jelly, and have "been otherways exceeding cruell to others; and they "ſay that the King allows it in his letters to them. In-"deed they have miſconſtrued all the King's letters to "their own ſence. They yet pray conſtantly for their "perſecuted brethren in England. They have many "things in their laws derogatory to his Majeſty's hon-

"nor,

In examining this firſt ſection, then, we find that the Doctor has preſumed to give a meaning to the term Civil Liberty different from the commonly received meaning; that he has preſumed to differ from St. Paul, in affirming that to be ſlavery which St. Paul declares to be liberty; that he has moſt illogically arranged different *genera* under the ſame claſs; and that he has ventured into the region of nonſenſe, in imagining that *natural liberty* and *political liberty* might exiſt together. What can we therefore conclude, but that his obſervations in this ſection are contradictory both to reaſon and ſcripture.

I ſhall now proceed to the conſideration of his ſecond ſection, which is intitled "Of Civil Li-" berty, and the Principles of Government," though when we conſider the matter it contains, any other title would have ſuited it nearly as well. We advance but a few ſentences in this, when we meet with the two following propoſitions, " in every free ſtate, every man is his " own legiſlator.—All taxes are free gifts for " public ſervices." Here the number of falſehoods is equal to the number of lines. *In every free ſtate, every man is his own legiſlator.* Admirable! When was it that *in Iſrael every man did*

" nor, of which the commiſſioners made a breviate, and " deſired that they might be altered; but they have yet " done nothing in it: among others, whoever keeps " Chriſtmas-day is to pay five pounds."

that

that which was right in his own eyes? According to Dr. Price, it was when Judea enjoyed the moſt perfect degree of Civil Liberty. According to the Bible, it was when the land was overrun with wickedneſs and profligacy, and a general anarchy had made the people loſe the ideas of civilization and ſink into ſemi barbarians.

But I ſcorn to take the Dr. tripping in an expreſſion. It is his dogmatical and ſeditious concluſions from ill-conſidered premiſes; and his factious declamations from no premiſes at all, that I think worthy of reprehenſion. By the preceding expreſſion I ſhall take it for granted he means, that the will of the whole in every free ſtate, gives law to the whole, or as he terms it, "All laws are particular regulations eſtabliſhed "by common conſent." Still theſe propoſitions are equally falſe with the former. They may indeed ſerve for texts to the diſturbers of the public peace; but a Chriſtian teacher, and a mathematician, ought to ſee demonſtration in them before he gives them the ſtamp of his authority; and that demonſtration can only be found by producing inſtances of ſocieties ſo governed. If the Dr. can produce no ſociety ſo governed, it follows from his own definition that he does not know one free ſociety on the face of the earth, or in other words that his own theory is an abſurdity.

Theoretical propoſitions, till they be realized by practice, are mere children of the brain, and

ſhould

ſhould they even be ſcientifically true, yet when we find it beyond the power of man to reduce them to practice, it is loſing time to beſtow much attention in the conſideration of them. But ſhould they relate to objects important to ſociety; and at the ſame time ſhould be found to be demonſtrably falſe, they may be the cauſes of innumerable evils to men; and the authors of them, if they will not diſclaim them, will be the deſerved objects of public execration.

The Doctor, I take it, imagines his political theorem true in ſpeculation, from the notion of the natural equality among men, which topic is a fine ſource of exclamation to him in the courſe of his pamphlet, as it has been to many others, ſince the days of Harrington to the preſent times. But ought he not to have been very ſure of this *natural equality*, before he ventured to erect ſuch an edifice upon it, which, when narrowly examined, will be found to be a *baſeleſs fabric*. I affirm his theorem to be falſe from the cleareſt conviction of the *natural inequality* of men, which, though it may perhaps be an obſervation hitherto not much attended to, will, I doubt not by the reflecting reader, be acknowledged to be as incontrovertible as any propoſition in Ariſtotle. Are all the trees of a foreſt of the ſame heighth and ſize? Every one will confeſs that they are not. Are all men born with the ſame natural talents and abilities? Daily obſervation proves that they are not. Can any thing then

be

be more natural than that from thoſe varied talents or gifts of nature, the vigorous, the active, and induſtrious, ſhould acquire wealth and influence; the indolent, inactive, and feeble, ſhould procure a ſubſiſtence, and ſhould ſtand in need of the protection of the others. By this it appears, that ſome men are rulers and others ſubjects by the very nature of man: and when we conſider what is the true end of government, this ſyſtem diſplays a beautiful arrangement worthy of the Supreme Being. We are told by the higheſt authority that government is *pro formidine malorum, &c.* for a terror to evil doers, and a praiſe to them that do well; and can any thing be more admirable (ſince all men are not born equal) than that ſome ſhould be born to be a terror to evil-doers, and a praiſe to them that do well. This does not include the leaſt idea either of tyranny on one hand, or of ſlavery on the other; and according to this explication, government is truly the ordinance of God.

The *natural inequality* of men, a truth ſo evident to every obſerver, appears then to be the ſource of their *political inequality*, or the cauſe of the firſt inſtitution of government. This ſimple inſtitution God ſuffers to be modified a thouſand ways; but in all thoſe thouſand modifications, there muſt in every ſingle ſociety be one center of union, otherwiſe it would be what it was not. It would be both one ſociety and not one ſociety. When the maſs of people living in the ſame ſociety augments, various ſubordinations take place,

and

and *artificial abilities* to protect and ſupport, I mean wealth and opulence, ſucceed to the *natural abilities* of courage, activity, and induſtry; though theſe laſt, when honourably exerted, have ſtill a moſt powerful influence to introduce their poſſeſſors into magiſtracies and places of authority, while the oppoſite *natural* qualities will gradually ſink the deſcendants of the moſt illuſtrious anceſtors into the claſs of the loweſt ſubjects; artificial abilities being more permanent than natural abilities; the influence of *ranks*, which is but another name for artificial abilities, will, therefore, in large ſocieties, become ſo conſiderable, as to be ſubſtituted in place of the leſs permanent powers; and in the Britiſh form of government the power of protecting, that is, of governing, is fixed in the *ranks* of Prince, of Nobles, of Gentry, of Freeholders, and Free Burgeſſes. But whatever be the form of the conſtitution of a ſtate, the true object of government is, that the rulers ſhould ſuppreſs and puniſh vice, and encourage and reward virtue, while, on the other hand, the ſubjects ſhould live peaceably and quietly, and conſequently happily; or otherwiſe at their peril. The ſyſtem above explained moſt naturally unfolds the cauſe of the diſſolution of luxurious and corrupt governments, where vice, and profligacy of manners prevail; for when viciouſneſs is ſo univerſally predominant that the rulers are tainted with it, and make a point of honouring and rewarding vice, and diſcountenancing and

puniſhing virtue, diſſolution as naturally follows in ſociety as in a wooden building ſet in flames*.

According to the ſyſtem I have explained, and which reaſon juſtifies, nature does not require that every man ſhould be his own ruler; but, according to Doctor Price, whoever does not enjoy Civil Liberty agreeable to his definition, or rather, to one of his definitions of it, that is, aſſiſt in making the laws that govern him, is a *poor abject animal, with no rights.* With no rights, dear Doctor! I have juſt now proved, that the ſubjects in every civil ſtate have a right to be encouraged in virtue, and protected againſt the attempts of wicked men; and I am very ſorry that the Britiſh government has ſo long with-held that right from her peaceable and well intentioned ſubjects in the colonies. The poor old woman of Macedon appears to have had truer notions of government than Doctor Price; for when ſhe petitioned King Philip for a redreſs of an injury that had been done her, and he ſlightingly put her off by ſay-

* From what has been ſaid, we may draw the following juſt concluſion, that thoſe who affirm, the perſonal or moral or moral character of magiſtrates or governors, has nothing at all to do with their public character, advance an opinion directly contradictory to the true principles of government; and might juſt as well affirm, that the beſt means to ſecure good health is to have corrupt blood in the veins. On the contrary, it may be laid down as a maxim, that the more rarely profligate characters riſe to authority, the more permanent and fixt will the happineſs of a ſtate or community naturally be.

ing,

ing, it was below his notice, ſhe very conſtitutionally replied, *What are you King for then?* which inſtantly awakened him to a ſenſe of his duty. But a Doctor Price would have told her, "As you do not give your conſent to the laws "by which you are governed, *you have no* "*rights.*" Oh, the blind infatuation of factious ſpirits!

Once more, to illuſtrate, by a practical caſe, the natural impoſſibility of even ſmall ſtates being ruled by the will of all the members that compoſe them, where private property is once eſtabliſhed, let us ſuppoſe the iſland of Madeira equally divided among one thouſand families, who arrive there, all young men and young women, with equal ſtocks, and equal authority: how long would that firſt equality ſubſiſt? not a dozen of years; for in that time we ſhould find ſome families without any children, and others with eight or nine; ſome of an indolent turn, who would decline having any concern in public affairs, and others, with ambitious ſpirits, who would have engroſſed more than their ſhare; ſome who had doubled the value of their property by their unwearied activity and induſtry; others, of a waſteful ſpirit, who had ſquandered theirs, and were living miſerably, or upon charity. Upon this laſt view, our Saviour's ſaying, *that you ſhall always have the poor with you*, appears not ſo much a prophecy as a maxim of true political foreſight; for while communities ſubſiſt upon earth, there will be found in them

numbers of indolent, inactive, thoughtleſs creatures, who will give their fellow-ſubjects the trouble of feeding and ſupporting them. And is it not curious to hear people affirm, that theſe have a natural right to be rulers, that is, protectors, when in fact their *natural right* is that of being protected by others. Is it not infinitely more probable that, in a generation or two, the inequality of conditions in this ſmall ſtate, would ariſe nearly as I have ſtated them, than that the ſons and grandſons, of the firſt ſettlers, would be living in the full enjoyment of every prerogative of their anceſtors. And may it not therefore be concluded, that an Utopian theory, contradictory, in fact, to the very nature of man, can never be a principle of government.

Having, I think, demonſtrably proved that the Doctor's perfect free ſtate is a perfect chimera, I ſhall proceed to give a few of the outlines of the Britiſh conſtitution, from which I believe it will be found to be the conſtitution the neareſt approaching to perfection of any on the face of the globe. The legiſlative body conſiſts of about eight hundred members; of theſe about two hundred and forty are hereditary, and the others, namely, ſixteen peers and five hundred fifty eight commoners, loſe their rights every ſeven years. Into the elective part, none but thoſe who have the fortunes of gentlemen are admitted, which implies not only an independence, but ſuch an education as may qualify the members to conſult on public affairs,

and

and prevent their being ſwayed by the impudent harangues of factious demagogues, which were wont to work on the paſſions of the blackſmiths and coblers of Athens and ancient Rome. Theſe elected members or repreſentatives may be natives, not only of Great Britain, but of Ireland, or of the Colonies; in ſhort, of any part of the Britiſh empire. The power of electing repreſentatives is in the hands of about 200,000 perſons, reſident in Britain, who are not the very loweſt of the people, for they muſt either poſſeſs a freehold of forty ſhillings a year, or be free burgeſſes, or pot-wallopers in ſome corporation *. Though the powers of legiſlation ſtop

* In the Roman republic, the power of electing, and I may even ſay the power of legiſlation, deſcended to the very vagrants, which was one chief cauſe of the ruin of that republic. The *Capite cenſi*, or the *Turba forenſis*, ſo called from their having no home but the porticoes of the Forum, and no note in the Cenſor's book but of their names, were of great conſequence in the elections at Rome, in the corrupt times of the republic. They were the great bawlers for liberty, and were ever ready to enter into the ſervice of a Cataline, a Marius, or a Cæſar. The following words give a moſt elegant deſcription of them. "Qui aſſidue pro LIBERTATE pugnant, preter aerem lucemque nihil in Italia poſſidere, ſed ſine lare ſine ſede, eos imperatores hortantur, ut pro aris ſociſque pugnarent; orbis terrarum Dominos verbo appellari, revera autem ne glebam terræ poſſidere." The voters in this claſs were in reality vagrants, who had Rome for their pariſh, and might ſleep where they could find a ſhelter. Theſe however had a ſhare in government, when I think they rather ſtood in the light of evil doers, to whom government ought to have been a terror.

ſtop with theſe 200,000 perſons, yet there is not a ſubject in the whole empire, either male or female, or even under age, who may not give a deliberative opinion upon affairs of government (abſtaining however from libellous and calumnious miſrepreſentation,) I mean, by the *liberty* of the *preſs*, of which precious liberty Doctor Price does not ſay one word, though his incohèrent paragraphs are ſo larded with the words Liberty and Slavery, and Slavery and Liberty, that I wonder the printer's ſtock of types was not exhauſted in compoſing them. To do him juſtice indeed, we find two ſentences in page 13, in favour of *Perſonal Liberty*, which ſtand like two ears of wheat in a field of tares. By the Liberty of the Preſs, which the Britiſh conſtitution allows of, women, I ſay, and even youths at ſchool and at the univerſity, may give their ſentiments on public affairs; and of late ſome women have eminently diſtinguiſhed themſelves in that line, though perhaps they might be as uſeful to the public, by confining themſelves to the exerciſe of their domeſtic talents. Should the acts of the ſupreme legiſlative body be diſapproved of by the majority of the nation, reſiſtance to thoſe acts is lawful, upon which principle every act, in a manner, appeals to the majority of the ſubjects for their approbation;

terror. We may gueſs at the rank of theſe legiſlators from that of their leader Sedulius, who Cicero ſays, "*propter inopiam tecti in foro pernoctavit*," which he jocoſely adds, gave him an opportunity of early intelligence.

and

and receives its ſtamp of authority from their acquieſcence, ſo they may be ſaid all to give their conſent. All colonies and corporations have free liberty to manage their private concerns by their own diſcretion, without any direct order from the executive power. No magiſtrate can impriſon any man one hour without ſhewing a cauſe. No Peer can be tried in any criminal caſe but by the whole body of the peerage. No commoner can be tried for any crime but by a jury of twelve of his peers *.

If a ſtate, poſſeſſing theſe privileges, is not a free ſtate, I own I can have no idea of one; but ſuch is the Britiſh ſtate. That it may be improved and brought nearer to perfection, has been obſerved by many political writers, and I very readily allow; but I am perſuaded my readers will agree, that Doctor Price's idea of improvement is a very falſe one, when he ſays, it is of no importance what the number of repreſentatives in the legiſlative body be, provided they be choſen by the majority of the people †. Now, though I could wiſh the preſent number of electors, or conſtituents, were augmented, I would much rather ſee their number diminiſhed three fourths, than that the number of members of the Houſe of Commons ſhould be diminiſhed three fourths. And I am inclined to think my ſentiment is juſt, as it appears agreeable to ſcrip-

* No Roman could be tried for his life but by an aſſembly repreſenting the whole people.

† Page 8.

ture,

ture, which ſays, *that in the multitude of counſellors there is wiſdom*. When I find ſcripture on on one ſide, and Doctor Price on the other, I do not heſitate which ſide to take.

We come now to the conſideration of the Doctor's ſecond propoſition, "That all taxes "are free gifts for public ſervices," which I affirm is equally falſe with his ſpeculative doctrine about the principles of civil government, above refuted. The obligatory nature of taxes has been explained in a pamphlet publiſhed two years ago *, where it is ſhewn, by arguments that appear to have the evidence of demonſtration, that public taxes in the Britiſh ſtate, from the Saxon times downwards, have never been *free gifts*, but *neceſſary duties*. For thoſe who may not have ſeen the arguments in that pamphlet, I ſhall here ſubjoin the following reaſoning and hiſtorical facts, which will ſerve to ſhew the Doctor's notions about taxes are as falſe and unconſtitutional as his notions about Civil Liberty.

The Doctor, as well as Lord Chatham, Lord Camden, Governor Pownal, and thouſands of others, has been miſled into the popular error, that *public taxes* were free gifts, becauſe *parliamentary grants* formerly were free gifts, which error having been ſo preſumptuouſly averred by ſome people here, has been one of the chief

* The Rights of the Britiſh Legiſlature to tax the Colonies vindicated.

cauſes

cauſes of involving our Colonies in miſery and blood. It is to be hoped that thoſe inſtigators have the feelings of men, and are ſorry for what they have done. Governor Pownal, I think, gives reaſons to conclude that he has altered his ſentiments on that point.

A narrow inſpection into the Engliſh hiſtory, ſhews plainly (what indeed our general hiſtorians take very little notice of) that the defence of the ſtate has always been obligatory upon the ſubjects. During the times of the Saxons it was the *trinoda neceſſitas* of the repair of bridges, the repair of caſtles, and the military expedition; and in the Norman times it was feudal tenures, implying *debita ſervitia* on the part of the ſubject, beſides which, the King poſſeſſed *jure coronæ*, or in right of his crown, independent of the gifts of Parliament, (which were then rare things, granted with frequent intermiſſions) a fifth-part of the lands of the kingdom; Dr. Henry ſays in ſome caſes a third. Our Kings, happily for the nation, were bad managers of their independent revenues; the progreſs of civilization has now aboliſhed all the Norman tenures, in ſo far as they regard taxation, and the *trinoda neceſſitas* of the Saxons is long gone into diſuſe, excepting only in the inſtance of *caſtle-guard*, which, I believe, ſtill ſubſiſts in one or two places. If ſome Kings ſquandered the royal domains, others added to them, ſuch as Edward III. in whoſe warlike reign they appear to be very conſiderable; for the Parliament in the fif-

tieth year of his reign declare, *that if the King's revenues had been rightly managed, he might long maintain his wars without any charge to the Commons.* Other Kings ſuch as Edward IV. and Henry VII. inſtead of enlarging them, only reſumed what had been *unconſtitutionally* given away; I ſay unconſtitutionally, for the royal domains were in thoſe days called and accounted the SACRED PATRIMONY of the Kings. In the pamphlet above referred to, it is ſhewn from the moſt indiſputable authority, that Edward IV. poſſeſſed an income in right of his crown, independent of Parliament, of what would be at preſent nearly equivalent to five millions a year, and for ſeveral years together he did not aſk a ſingle farthing of his Parliament, that is, the ſubjects paid no taxes reſembling thoſe of the preſent times, excepting the cuſtoms. Between the time of Henry VII. and the time of Charles I. thoſe royal domains, which were once ſo conſiderable, were all put into the ſubjects hands, and became private property; and then the patriots of Charles's time very heroically did as good as tell the King, that he might live as a King, and defend the nation upon NOTHING. I ſay, did, *in a manner*, tell the King; for they could not help confeſſing that the crown, that is, the governing power, had a RIGHT to *the tenures by barony, grand ſerjeanty, knights ſervice in capite, knights ſervice, the profits of wardſhip, liveries, premier ſeiſines, marriages, reliefs, fines for alienation, cuſtoms, wrecks, treaſure trove, eſcheats,*

eſcheats, forfeitures, and many other caſual profits. Therefore they concluded Parliament ſhould give him nothing; for ſo little did they underſtand the nature of the conſtitution, or of a civil conſtitution in general, that they kept continually talking of *their affairs*, meaning the ſubjects affairs, as diſtinct from *his affairs*, that is, the King's affairs. The unhappy King not having the ſpirit to reſume the royal patrimony, which would have raiſed a neſt of hornets about him, and finding that the invention of gun-powder, and the practices of the age had introduced ſuch eſſential alterations both in ſea and land armaments, that the tenures by barony, knights-ſervice, &c. which by many evaſions were dwindled into nothing, left the kingdom in a manner defenſeleſs, attempted an ILLEGAL ACT; and, in his regal or executive capacity, compelled the ſubjects to give their aſſiſtance to the ſtate in an uncommon way, not juſtified by the conſtitution.

The convulſions that followed brought us the preſent happy conſtitution of liberty that we poſſeſs, in which the people, by their ſhare in the legiſlative aſſembly, that is, by holding the purſe and revenue of the nation, are become the judges when it is proper to call forth the ſtrength of the ſtate, either offenſively or defenſively; but it is now as it was in former times, whenever that ſtrength or aid is called forth, the ſubject muſt obey at his peril. This, I ſay, is the capital difference betwixt our preſent conſtitution and

our old; for, ſince the Revolution, it would be as unconſtitutional for our Kings to poſſeſs five millions a year in royal domains independent of Parliament, as it was formerly held to be unconſtitutional, nay, even impious, to alienate thoſe domains. It was one great object of the Parliaments of old, with what policy I need not ſay, to take all opportunities of enlarging thoſe domains; but happily their endeavours were counteracted by the rapacity of the courtiers. The Parliament made a law in the reign of Richard the II. "that whatſoever cometh to the "King by judgment, eſcheat, forfeiture ward-"ſhip, or any other ways, ſhall not be given "away; and the procurer of any gift ſhall be "puniſhed." The ſame law was renewed in the reign of his ſucceſſor, with the addition of a penalty, "of double value to every mover or "procurer of every ſuch grant:" and four years afterwards it was enacted, "that no peti-"tion *for any thing* ſhould be delivered to the "King but in the preſence of the council, who "might examine it, leſt the King's wants might "light upon the Commons."

The change in our conſtitution does not alter the principle, that the governing power has a right to demand aid of the ſubjects, or that taxes are obligatory. The term *trinoda neceſſitas* in the Saxon period, certainly implied an *obligation*; and this in the Norman times was altered into *debita ſervitia*, which alſo implies an *obligation*. All this the people in former days knew full

full well, without ever dreaming that they were ſlaves on that account, or that they had no property. It does not appear that Henry VI. gave any alarm, when, by a proclamation, he told his ſubjects, " that by the law he could compel " every man in the kingdom, and at his own " charge, to attend his ſervice; but that he " would then excuſe them if every man would " pay him the expence of two days attendance." How clearly by our old conſtitution the diſtinction was obſerved between the *debita ſervitia*, and the *ſubſidia*, or ſubſidies of Parliament, appears from a very curious ſuit in the Exchequer in the time of Edward III. The Prior of Coventry was then attached to anſwer to the King *de ſervitio octo feodorum militum*, for the ſervice of eight knights fees that had been concealed and ſuppreſſed ſince the time of Henry III. The Prior pleaded, that though the Exchequer rolls might ſhew the value of ten fees then paid; yet he, as well as his predeceſſors, only held by two fees, and that the payment for eight more was only an occaſional parliamentary grant in the time of Henry III. on account of making his ſon a knight, and three years after for the marriage of his ſiſter to the Emperor Frederick. The words of the record are, " quoad hoc quod compertum eſt hic in rotulis, quod tempore dicti Regis Henrici tertii, computatum fuit de certis pecuniæ ſummis de auxiliis eidem Regi Henrico ad filium ſuum militem faciendum, et ſororem ſuam maritandam conceſſis, hoc ei non prejudicat

judicat in hac parte. Dicit enim quod *auxilia illa* non fuerunt, nec cenſeri poſſunt eſſe *ſervitia*, immo quædam *ſubſidia* per magnates et communitatem regni *ſpontanea* & mera voluntate Regi conceſſa." That is, and as to its being found here in the rolls, that in the time of King Henry III. a computation was made of certain ſums of money granted as *aids* to the ſaid King, for making his ſon a knight, and marrying his ſiſter, this does not prejudice him on this point. For he affirms, that *thoſe aids* were not, nor cannot be deemed to be the uſual obligatory taxes, which every man is obliged to pay according to the quantity of land he poſſeſſes. On the contrary, they were only ſome *ſubſidies* granted to the King by the Lords and Commons of the kingdom ſpontaneouſly and as a mere free gift. Here we have the *obligatory public taxes* moſt plainly contraſted with the *parliamentary free gifts*. Theſe parliamentary gifts in the reign of Edw. III. probably did not make a tenth-part of the *national ſupplies*, or as they were then conſtitutionally called, the *King's ſupplies*. For we find that King towards the end of his reign declaring to his Parliament, *that to all the ornaments, albeit the ſubject to their pains contributed, yet was the ſame far more infinite charge to the Prince.* In the reign of Charles I. the parliamentary gifts probably made a full half of the public taxes; and then it began to be forgot that the ruling power had ever had a right to more ample revenues of another kind, Lord Coke himſelf

himſelf ſeeming to be at a loſs what opinion to form about it. How this great change was effected we may give ſome gueſs from the Exchequer proceſs above mentioned; for I have reaſons which I cannot now enlarge upon, for ſuſpecting that the Prior's lawyer urged a falſe plea; and if eight knights fees out of ten could be ſuppreſſed in about eighty years, we may well ſuppoſe there were numberleſs evaſions in the ſpace of three hundred years; and that the tenures by barony, knights-ſervice, and other ſources of crown revenue, which the Parliament referred Charles I. to, were far from being ſo ample as they had been three or four centuries before. But the great cauſe of the alteration, was the loſs of the vaſt royal domain, that was become private property *; and was actually ſo much power

* We may form ſome conjecture in what manner the royal domain was diſſipated, and was become in the reign of Charles I. altogether inſufficient for the defence of the nation, and the ſupport of the crown, from the following fact mentioned by Sir Robert Cotton, who in his poſthumous works tells us, "that the eccleſiaſtical "tenths annually or often paid to the Pope in former "times, and at the Reformation veſted in the crown by "an act of Henry VIII. were nevertheleſs, *in his time*, "got into the hands of the laity, *though no ſubſequent act* "*had diſcharged them.*"

Though the patriots in the times of James I. and Charles I. denied the King the power of *taking*; they freely allowed him the full power of *giving away*. And yet by the conſtitution as it then ſtood, the King had no more right to give away the SACRED PATRIMONY of the crown, than he had to take a farthing from the ſubject by a mode not preſcribed by the ſupreme legiſlature.

tumbled

tumbled out of the ſcale of prerogative authority into the ſcale of the people, who, before the ballance could be rightly trimmed again, quickly ſhewed that they did not know how to uſe the power they had got.

By the ancient Britiſh conſtitution then it is evident all the ſubjects were obliged by the fundamental law of the ſtate to give their aſſiſtance in its defence in proportion to their property, *at the call of the crown*. By the modern Britiſh conſtitution the ſame obligation remains upon the ſubject, *at the call of the ſupreme legiſlature*. No privilege, no charter can give an exemption from this obligation, for in the Saxon times the charters expreſs that the *trinoda neceſſitas nulli unquam relaxari poteſt*, the duty of defending the ſtate can be forgiven to no man. Lawyers have decided, that a tenure granted in the words *abſque aliquid inde reddendo*, ſtill implied an obligation to national defence; and in the time of Henry VI. on a grant made in the words, *tenendum cy frankement come le Roy eſt en ſon corone*, to be held as freely as the King holds his crown, a deciſion was given that the patentee was not exempt from military ſervice.

From theſe hiſtorical details, which I have arranged as conciſely as I could, we may conclude that though parliamentary grants were formerly *free gifts* to our Kings *without account*, yet the taxes for public defence in the Britiſh ſtate never were free gifts. And indeed by the law of reaſon they cannot; for common ſenſe tells

tells us, that government, which is the protecting power, could not protect if every individual gave his aſſiſtance in perilous caſes, only ſo far as he himſelf choſe. Can any thing be more abſurd, than that the ſubjects in a civil ſtate ſhould be bound by law in every thing relative to ſociety, but ſhould have no obligation upon them but their own free will in regard to the public defence of the ſtate? If ſuch a ſyſtem exiſts any where upon this globe, I ſhould have been glad that Doctor Price would have been ſo good as to name the country where it is to be found.

According to the improved modern conſtitution of the Britiſh ſtate, parliamentary grants are no longer benevolencies or free gifts to the King, to be uſed as he pleaſes without account; but they are the public revenues of the ſtate, ordained by an act of the legiſlature, all deliberations concerning them beginning in the aſſembly of the people. Hoping therefore that I have proved this in a ſatisfactory manner to my readers, I ſhall at preſent conclude my obſervations on this ſubject with the two following corollaries, which appear evident deductions from what has been ſaid.

Firſt, ſince the ſtate has now no public revenues but thoſe of Parliament, thoſe revenues are of DUTY and NECESSITY, and the words *giving* and *granting* on the part of the ſubjects, and of *thanking* on the part of the executive power, are mere empty forms; and that a taxing law is of the nature of other laws, and ought

to aſſume that form of, BE IT ENACTED by the authority of the King, Lords, and Commons. It would be very inconcluſive, and contrary to fact, to affirm that the preſent body-guard of the King of France are Scotchmen, becauſe when their muſter-roll is called, they anſwer to their names by the word *amheer*. It would only be a proof that *forms* remain when *realities* are gone *.

Secondly, ſince our Kings are not now in a capacity to carry on wars, but by the aſſiſtance of Parliament, the prerogative belonging to the crown of declaring peace and war is a prerogative in *form* only, though formerly the great royal domain and revenue *jure coronæ* made it an effectual one. This independent revenue appears to have led our Princes into very idle ſchemes of

* This point, of the obligatory nature of taxes, has hitherto been but too little the object of diſcuſſion, either in print or in Parliament. Two years ago I ventured, in the face of univerſal prejudice, to give an illuſtration and proof of it, which brought from Governor Pownal an apology for the old hypotheſis; but he has not choſen to reply to my anſwer. Our great popular orator, above ten years ago, talked near three hours about it, and about it, without beſtowing a ſingle paragraph of ratiocination upon it. Doctor Price, excluſive of the page he lays to the charge of Lord Shelburne, does not beſtow ten lines upon it in the whole of his performance. Now, in fact, the American controverſy entirely hinges upon it; for if taxes be free gifts, the rebels are in the right; but if taxes are nothing but the united aid of the ſtate called into action at the will of the ſupreme legiſlature, then we may ſay of the claim of the rebels what Cicero ſaid of Cæſar's invaſion of his country, *cauſa illa cauſam non habet*; it is a cauſe without a cauſe.

ambition;

ambition; and made them have one intereſt, and their people another, ſo that the *King's affairs* and the *peoples affairs* were looked upon as different things, which ſeems to be the true origin of *whig* and *tory*, diſtinctions that have now no foundation. The Parliament of Ed. III. tell him that he might long have carried on HIS wars without any charge to the Commons; and Carew who wrote his ſurvey in Queen Elizabeth's time, ſays in praiſe of the people of Foy in Cornwall, "during the warlike reigns of our "two valiant Edwards, the Foyens addicted "themſelves to back *their Princes quarrel*, by "coping with the enemy at ſea." So then it was not the nation's quarrel! moſt aſſuredly it was not, in more ſenſes than one. By the preſent happy conſtitution the intereſts of the King and people are united, and all wars that the Britiſh nation engage in muſt now be national wars.

Having now finiſhed my obſervations on the nature of taxation, I ſhall proceed to expoſe the fallacy of another propoſition of the Doctor's in this ſecond ſection, if, indeed, that can be called a propoſition, which is ſo involved in the terms, that the meaning of it is rather to be gueſſed at than perceived. The Doctor tells us, "that "the account now given of the principles of "public liberty, and the nature of an equal "and free government, ſhews what judgment "we ſhould form of that OMNIPOTENCE, which "it has been ſaid, muſt belong to every go-"vernment as ſuch. Great ſtreſs has been

"laid on this; but moſt unreaſonably." I ſuſpect he here means a cenſure of the truly conſtitutional principle of the declaratory act, that the King, Lords, and Commons, have a *right* to govern in all caſes whatſoever, which, for ſeveral years paſt, has been a fine ſubject for ſeditious declamation, and been deemed by the ignorant an innovation in our conſtitution. If ill connected propoſitions and vague exclamations might paſs for reaſoning, the Doctor might rank among the ſtrenuous oppugners of the ſupremacy of the ſupreme power. But to ſhew him and them that the principle of the declaratory act is no novelty, I will give them the opinion of a very worthy and a very learned man upon it, I mean Sir Thomas Smith, who was Secretary and Privy Counſellor to Queen Elizabeth. His elegant and ample deſcription of the power of Parliament is as follows: *In comitiis Parliamentariis poſita eſt omnis auguſtæ abſolutæque poteſtatis vis, quippe quemadmodum robur et virtus Angliæ dicuntur in acie reſidere. Parliamentaria comitia veteres leges jubent eſſe irritas, novas inducunt, præſentibus juxta ac futuris modum conſtituunt, jura et poſſeſſiones hominum privatorum commutant, ſpurios natalibus reſtituunt, cultum divinum ſanctionibus corroborant, pondera & menſuras variant,—incerti juris controverſias dirimunt ubi nihil lege cautum fuit, cenſum agunt, capitationes et vectigalia indicunt, delictorum gratiam faciunt, afflictas et majorum ſceleribus perditas familias erigunt, vitæ neciſque poteſtatem in eos obtinent*

*nent quos ad hujuſmodi diſquiſitiones Princeps advocaverat, atque ut concludam breviter, quicquid in centuriatis comitiis aut in tribunitiis populus Romanus officere potuiſſet, id omne in comitiis Anglicanis tanquam in lætu principem populumque repreſentante commode tranſigitur. Intereſſe enim in illo conventu omnes intelligimur cujuſcunque amplitutinis ſtatus aut dignitatis, Princepſve aut plebs fuerit, ſive per ſeipſum hoc fiat, ſive per procuratorem, nam omnibus peræque gratum eſſe oportet quicquid ex ſenatus conſulto Parliamentario profectum eſt**. For the ſake of the Engliſh reader I ſhall give the tranſlation of this paſſage : " For as the ſtrength " and manhood of England are ſaid to reſide " in her arrayed militia, even ſo all the power " of imperatorial and abſolute authority is placed " in her parliamentary aſſemblies. The parliamentary aſſemblies repeal old laws and make " new ones, they make regulations for future affairs as well as preſent, they change the " rights and poſſeſſions of private men, they " legitimate natural children, they make penal " laws, in regard to divine worſhip, they vary " weights and meaſures,—they decide diſputed " points of right, where the law has made no " proviſion, they ſettle ſubſidies, they appoint " poll-taxes and other taxes ; they make acts of " grace and pardon for criminals ; they reſtore " the blood of families whoſe anceſtors have " been attainted, they have the power of life and " death, I mean thoſe appointed by the Prince

* De Repub. & Admin. Anglor. Tho. Smith, l. ii. c. 2.

" for

" for ſuch purpoſes; and, in a word, whatever " the Roman people could do either in their cen- " turiate or tribunitiate aſſemblies, all that is " conſtitutionally done in the Engliſh Parlia- " ment, as in an aſſembly repreſenting Prince " and people. For we are all underſtood to be " preſent in that aſſembly, of whatever rank, " ſtate, or dignity, whether Prince or com- " moner, either by himſelf or by a repreſenta- " tive; for whatever is enacted by Parliament " ought to be agreeable to every one."

This extract plainly ſhews us what were the thoughts of a very good judge of the power of Parliament in Queen Elizabeth's days, and that the opinion of its abſolute authority is no novelty. Now let us examine this declaratory act by the rule of reaſon, and firſt let us conſider the terms. It ſays the King, Lords, and Commons have authority to govern in all caſes whatſoever; and as theſe are very unlimited terms, the abuſive interpretation of them has been moſt unlimited. But I appeal to every man of ſenſe and candour, whether they mean any thing more than that the Parliament has the ſame authority in the colonies as in Great Britain, or the coloniſts have the ſame right to the protection of Parliament (to which they have often applied) as the inhabitants of Great Britain. Do we in this iſland reſt uneaſily in our beds becauſe we know the Parliament has a right to govern us in all caſes whatſoever? Do we expect to be enjoined at what hour we ſhall riſe in the morning,

ing, how many glaſſes of wine we may drink after dinner, how many cabbages we may plant in our garden, how often we ſhall waſh our hands? Nothing but the moſt captious ſpirit of ſedition could draw any ſuch inferences from the expreſſion, which only means that the ſupreme power of the ſtate can admit of no other power to controul its operations relative to the well-being of the ſociety over which it preſides.

But the Doctor ſeems to think, for I own in pages 15 and 16, I can hardly diſcover his meaning, he ſo writes about and about his ſubject; I ſay he ſeems to think, that this claim in rulers *degrades mankind into a body of vaſſals deſcending like cattle from one ſet of owners to another, who have an abſolute dominion over them.* If that be his opinion, I will venture to ſay, He errs, not knowing the ſcriptures, nor the conſtitution of his country. Scripture makes a very wide difference between government and abſolute dominion. I have before given the ſcripture count of government, which is an authority to ſuppreſs vice and promote virtue. I ſhall now explain what it ſays of abſolute dominion. After the flood we are told, that God gave to man abſolute dominion over the beaſts of the earth, the fowls of the air, and the fiſhes of the ſea; the plain meaning of which is, I give you full authority, at your pleaſure, to deprive any of them of breath and life, juſt as freely as I deprive any of you of life at my pleaſure. What excellent logicians muſt thoſe men be, who conclud

clude, that any form of government on earth inveſts rulers with the ſame authority over men; and how well qualified they are for becoming members of the African company! I rather think that moſt governments, even the freeſt, aſſume too great authority over the life of man, and that a great reformation in that reſpect is wanted in the laws of Great Britain. The diſtinction that Scripture makes between government and abſolute dominion is very conſpicuous, and ought ever to be had in remembrance; and yet how cunningly, or how ignorantly have they often been confounded by ſeditious writers*.

Having

* It is with regret I obſerve a man of abilities wandering after the falſe light of Dr. Price, I mean the author of a Sermon preached at Cambridge on the 29th of May, 1776; in which diſcourſe are ſeveral very abſurd and erroneous propoſitions, intermixed with much good ſenſe and natural eloquence. "By the great charter," he ſays," "under which man claims dominion over the "other animals of the earth, God did not give any one "man dominion over another." Who doubts that? But what has the government of men over beaſts to do with the government of men over men? Had the Rev. Profeſſor but well conſidered his own text, he might have ſeen clearly, that the government of men means no more than, *the force of ſociety united in protecting the virtuous, and puniſhing the vicious*, as I have already explained it.

I am aſtoniſhed that any man of diſcernment could advance the two following propoſitions, which the experience even of children is ſufficient to diſprove. "We are all born into the world with the ſame natural "advantages"——"The equal diſtribution of natural "good is accompanied with an equality of natural facul-"ties."

Having ſhewn that government, according to Scripture, by no means implies abſolute domi-

" ties." Notwithſtanding theſe aſſertions in page 2, the author, in page 3, allows of ſome " natural inequa-
" lity——which, nevertheleſs, among free agents, does
" not induce any natural inequality."

The latter part of this ſermon is only an amplification of the trite maxim, that if this nation is ever undone, it muſt be by a Parliament; but towards the concluſion the author again deviates into an unconſtitutional ſentiment, when aſſuming the character of apologiſt for the factious, he ſays, they may alledge, " that the only dif-
" ference between the reſiſtance of the people in the
" time of Charles I. and the preſent reſiſtance in Ame-
" rica is, that in the former period, it was a part of the
" nation that then reſiſted the King, becauſe he would
" have taken from them their property without their
" conſent, given by themſelves or their repreſentatives;
" and now it is a part of the empire, which reſiſts the
" legiſlature for the ſame reaſon." According to this ſophiſm, there is no difference between a collector of the land-tax and a houſe-breaker; for they both knock at your door, they both take your money from you, and they both take it without your conſent: for few houſe-keepers, I believe, would pay the land-tax or any other tax, *if they could help it*; but they know that reſiſting the legiſlature, in a *lawful act*, would not only be a want of duty, but would be very perilous to themſelves. That it is a *lawful act* of the legiſlature; nay, that it is its *inherent right* to DEMAND taxes from all the ſubjects, has before been clearly demonſtrated from page 24 to 33 and alſo in *the Right of the Britiſh Legiſlature vindicated, ſecond edition.* The idea of taxes being free gifts of the individual is as much an unconſtitutional idea, as it would be ungeographical to affirm, that there are no antipodes. Great names have erred in both; but thoſe who have a higher regard for truth, than for the authority of great names, will hardly, I think, any longer maintain the former idea.

nion, I ſhall now ſubmit it to my readers, whether the Doctor, by his manner of arguing againſt the declaratory act, does not prove himſelf ignorant of the conſtitution. *Nothing*, he ſays, (page 15,) *can be more abſurd than the doctrine ſome have taught with reſpect to the omnipotence of Parliaments.* Here, according to his uſual vague ſtile, the doctrine which ſome have taught, and which he is combating, is not expreſſed, nor indeed is it once any where expreſſed in the three or four pages where he ſeems to treat about it: He goes on, *Parliaments poſſeſs no power beyond the limits of the truſt, for the execution of which they were formed.* Who doubts that? Again, *if omnipotence can with any ſenſe be aſcribed to a legiſlature, it muſt be lodged where all legiſlative authority originates, that is, in the people.* Agreed; perfectly agreed. But what does all this ſay againſt the principle of the declaratory act? It all tends to confirm it; for what is a legiſlative act by the Britiſh conſtitution, but an act of the people? It has before been ſhewn to be a fundamental law in our conſtitution, that whenever the majority of the people diſapprove of an act of Parliament, reſiſtance is lawful, and a revolution of government may enſue; but the acquieſcence of the majority gives a full authority to the legiſlative act to bind the whole community in civil matters. Becauſe the majority of a ſociety, conſiſting of many millions of people, have a right to reſiſt, is it either good logic or true conſtitutional language to ſay, that the minority,

nority, ſhould they be a million, or two millions, have a right to do the ſame? ſuch ſophiſtry will not paſs even upon the authority of Mr. Pitt. When he in a raving fit preſumed to ſay, that he was glad the Boſtonians had reſiſted, he ſhewed himſelf ignorant of the conſtitution, he deſerved the cenſure of the aſſembly before whom he ſpoke, and ought not to have been ſuffered to proceed without aſking their pardon. We have lately ſeen a young Lord of great fire, of genius, and vigour of mind, give a moſt ſpirited check to ſuch unconſtitutional language in a Duke of Richmond and a Lord Camden, which is a proceeding that does him great honour; for certainly liberty of debate has its bounds, as well as liberty of action. By the principles of the Britiſh conſtitution, *res Britanniæ nolunt male adminiſtrari*, the Parliament have no right to alter fundamental laws without the acquieſcence of the people; but that they have altered them with that acquieſcence is moſt certain, witneſs the ſeptennial act, witneſs the ſixteen clauſes of Magna Charta that have been repealed; witneſs the act of leſſening the number of conſtituents in the time of Henry VI. and others that might be mentioned. The Britiſh legiſlature then in aſſuming to itſelf an omnipotence, as Dr. Price is pleaſed to term it, always ſuppoſes the acquieſcence of the majority of the people; for we all know our Parliament ſtands every moment accountable to the nation; but never to the minority. Therefore it is downright folly and rebel-

lion in the Penſylvanian Farmer, to give it as the principle upon which he and his aſſociates act, *nolumus leges Angliæ mutari*, we will not have the laws of England altered, when the ſupreme legiſlature, in making a new law with the acquieſcence of the nation, declare *we will have the laws of England altered.* Dr. Price, then from his little ſally againſt the declaratory act, appears to me to be an advocate of rebellion; I will not ſay deſignedly, but from his ignorance of the nature of our conſtitution. And I think the terms of the act itſelf, when rightly underſtood, can give no offence to any Britiſh ſubject in any part of the empire; for I defy all the apologiſts of the rebels, to give one inſtance of any civil government on earth, that does not act up to the ſpirit of it.

Dr. Price towards the end of this ſection quits argument, and falls into declamation, of which the following ſpecimen is, I think, worth the readers' peruſal. "Many a ſycophant of power "have the people of this kingdom ſacrificed. "Often have they fought and bled in the cauſe "of liberty. But that time ſeems to be going." I hope it is gone for ever; for when liberty is perfectly ſecure it would be downright madneſs to be fighting and bleeding for her, of which I doubt not the coloniſts will ſoon be convinced. He proceeds: "The fair inheritance of liberty "left us by our anceſtors, many of us are not "willing to reſign. An abandoned venality, "the inſeparable companion of diſſipation and "extravagance,

" extravagance, has poiſoned the ſprings of pub-
" lic virtue among us: and ſhould any events
" ever ariſe that ſhould render the ſame oppoſi-
" tion neceſſary that took place in the times of
" King Charles I. and James II. I am afraid all
" that is valuable to us would be loſt. The
" terror of the ſtanding army, the danger of
" the public funds, and the all-corrupting in-
" fluence of the treaſury, would deaden all
" zeal, and produce general acquieſcence and
" ſervility." This, in my apprehenſion, is preciſely what is called writing for the alehouſes; and it is with regret I obſerve, that too much of Dr. Price's pamphlet is of this ſtamp; but I hope I ſhall not be obliged to expoſe any more of it, and that my readers are ſatisfied with the preſent ſpecimen.

We come now to the Doctor's third ſection, which is entitled, *Of the Authority of one Country over another*. I muſt begin my refutation of the unconſtitutional reaſoning in this ſection by ſome remarks upon the title; and in ſhewing the abſurdity or rather the ſophiſtry of that title, I, in a manner, refute the whole ſection. The word *country* in the Engliſh language, in a direct ſenſe is nearly equivalent to the word *territory*, and has a very great latitude of ſignification. *Country*, in the Highlands of Scotland, means a narrow glen ſeparated from another glen by an intervening mountain; in the language of our peaſants it means a diſtrict extending about a day's

day's journey round their habitations; and in this ſenſe the Britiſh government extends over a thouſand countries. Geographers carry it farther, and portion out the earth into large tracts diſtinguiſhed by very particular boundaries; but politicians, without regarding the diſtinctions of geographers, mean by *country* all territory (however geographically divided) under the ſame domination. Thus Portugal is called a country, though in the geographical diviſion it makes but a part of Spain. The two Sicilies are called a country, though they conſiſt of a part of Italy in conjunction of government with the iſland of Sicily. The Ruſſian empire is reckoned one country, though part of it lies in Europe, and by far the greateſt part of it in Aſia. By the *country* of *Turkey* every merchant underſtands a country under the dominion of the Grand Signior, lying part in Europe, part in Aſia, and part in Africa; and *country* when applied to the Britiſh ſtate means a territory, part in Europe, and part in the other three quarters of the globe.

Therefore the expreſſion, *of the authority of one country over another*, either in the direct geographical or direct political ſenſe of the word *country*, is an expreſſion next a-kin to nonſenſe, and has a very obſcure meaning. Does the Doctor take the word *country* in a metaphorical ſenſe for *the people of a country?* I wonder ſuch an accurate reaſoner as he wiſhes to be thought, could be guilty of ſuch an overſight; and then I ſay

I ſay of his whole third ſection *quid ad nos*, what at all has the whole of it to do with the revolt of colonies againſt the government of the ſtate of which they are members?

Is an inhabitant of Great Britain and Ireland a foreigner in the Britiſh colonies in North America; or is a native of thoſe colonies a foreigner in Great Britain and Ireland? Was Mr. Trecothick, or was Mr. Huſke, made a Britiſh ſubject by a bill of naturalization? Or has Mr. Cruger ever been naturalized? No; both he and they, from their birth, were entitled to all the noble privileges of Britiſh ſubjects, becauſe they were born within the Britiſh dominions. Are not the natives of Britain and the natives of the Britiſh colonies *fellow-ſubjects*; and among fellow-ſubjects, that ſome ſhould be rulers and others ruled, we have ſeen is in the very eſſence of government, and is the actual ſtate of every free civil ſociety on earth. That one ſociety can have but one centre of legiſlative union is alſo equally evident. Whoever is convinced of theſe truths will moſt plainly perceive the pitiful ſophiſtry that runs through the whole of this ſection under the falſe preſumption, that Great Britain is one political country, and her American colonies another. How mighty eaſy it is to draw ſeditious conſequences from falſe premiſes! The Doctor's premiſes being incontrovertibly falſe, all that he ſays about *one country* and *another country*, has no more relation to Great Britain and her colonies than to *Perſia* and *China*.

After

After ſome very general and trifling reflections on his own premiſes, the Doctor employs page 21, and the three following, in giving an erroneous repreſentation of the progreſſion from peaceable government to anarchy in Maſſachuſet's Bay, the various ſteps of which progreſſion are, according to him, all owing to miſgovernment at home. Now I will venture to ſay, that they are owing, in a much greater degree, to the operation of ſeditious and rebellious principles in the colony. Our government, however it may lay claim to *omnipotence*, according to Dr. Price's phraſe, never yet laid claim to *infallibility*; for there hardly ever paſſes a ſeſſion of Parliament without ſome acts being *amended*. Therefore every one acknowledges that grievances may flow from acts of Parliament; but it is Parliament alone that can redreſs thoſe grievances; and it is a rule in every government, *woe to thoſe ſubjects that take upon them to redreſs their own grievances*. The people of Maſſachuſet's Bay, when they found themſelves aggrieved, ought to have petitioned the ſupreme legiſlature; but, to the beſt of my remembrance, there is no inſtance of any petition from them to Parliament for theſe ten years paſt. The laſt petition, I think, was for the repeal of the ſtamp act, and the prayer of the petition was granted. Inſtead of applying to this true ſource and fountain of healing-waters, for their political concerns, they have, in the ſtubbornneſs of their hearts, hewn out to themſelves broken ciſterns that can hold

no

no water. They have taken it into their heads to be ſtout-hearted, and forgetting that they were Britiſh ſubjects, have dared to make a hoſtile reſiſtance to acts of the ſupreme legiſlature, from which proceeding they now feel very melancholy conſequences. For the continuance of thoſe melancholy effects they muſt entirely blame themſelves; for they may bring back their uſual ſun-ſhine, whenever they pleaſe——*to be obedient*.

The Doctor proceeds, "it may be aſked,—"Are there not cauſes by which one ſtate may "acquire a *rightful* authority over another, "though not conſolidated by an adequate re-"preſentation? I anſwer that there are no ſuch "cauſes." Such is the Doctor's anſwer to his own queſtion. But I anſwer, there was not the leaſt need of making ſuch an abſurd queſtion; for the reaſoning about the authority of the ſupreme Britiſh legiſlature over the colonies has nothing at all to do with the authority of one ſtate over another, as the Britiſh colonies are not *ſtates* but parts of the Britiſh ſtate. The Doctor might juſt as well give us a long diſſertation about the properties of a triangle, when the queſtion was about the properties of a circle; or favour the world with a demonſtration, that a circle may have two centres.

Though the Doctor's queſtion has nothing at all to do with the ſovereignty of the Britiſh legiſlature over all the Britiſh dominions; yet as he has, in his own anſwers to it, preſumed to ad-

vance principles not only diametrically oppoſite to ſcripture but to common ſenſe; and has laid them down with ſuch a dictatorial air as may miſlead weak minds into ſedition and rebellion, I beg my readers indulgence while I expoſe the abſurdity and diabolical tendency of his reaſoning on this point. Neither *conqueſts*, nor *compact*, nor *obligations conferred*, he ſays, can give any rightful authority to one ſtate over another. As to conqueſt in a juſt war, that in his opinion gives only a right to indemnification, and a reaſonable ſecurity againſt future injury. Now let us ſuppoſe that the conquering nation can ſee no *reaſonable ſecurity* againſt future injury, but in maintaining an immediate rule over the conquered, according to the Doctor they have a full right to this *rule*; ſo very inconſiſtent is he with himſelf, and ſo very inconſiſtent muſt falſe doctrines ever be with truth.

When a conquering nation aſſumes the rule of a ſubdued nation, it ſays, in fact, I will not exterminate you; but I have found you ſo very malicious, that for the future I will take upon me to be the puniſher of evil-doers, and the rewarder of the virtuous among you, as I find in ſo doing, I violate no law human or divine. While this continues to be the ſpirit of the ruling nation, the ſcripture recommends the ſword to be ſheathed, and that the ruled ſhould obey. But Dr. Price cannot diſtinguiſh ſuch obedience from ſlavery, and an extinction of inalienable rights of human nature, which are according to him

him *legiſlating for one's ſelf*, and giving to the ruling power, only what ſhare of one's property one thinks fit. Now it has been already ſhewn, that the natural inequality of mankind is a moſt evident demonſtration, that ſuch rights are not among the inalienable rights of man. Therefore, ſince the Doctor's premiſes are again found to be falſe, his conſequence muſt alſo be falſe; and indeed we find it expreſly condemned by our Saviour, who, when the Phariſees aſked him if it was lawful to pay tribute to Cæſar, told them that they ought to pay it. Our Saviour's reply to the ſeditious Phariſees plainly admits of the following interpretation. "I perceive what miſchief you have in your hearts, from the enſnaring and ſeditious nature of your queſtion; but do not imagine that your evil purpoſes ſhall have any countenance from me. This country of Judæa forms at preſent a province of the Roman empire. I do not enquire how or when it became ſuch. But by the power of that ſtate every man among you is protected, and his property ſecured; therefore it is your duty to render unto Cæſar the things that are Cæſar's; that is, to yield a peaceable ſubmiſſion to magiſtracy, and to ſupport the protecting power in protecting you; and it is your duty to yield that ſupport with a ſpirit of meekneſs and peace; for to that the governing power has a full and juſt right. I do not here preach up *paſſive obedience* to you, for I acknowledge

" you have rights that are inalienable to " you as men, and that Cæſar can have no " power over. But thoſe *rights* you remain " in full poſſeſſion of. Are not we allowed " to worſhip in this temple? Have not I " read the Scriptures to you, and exhorted you " in the ſynagogue? Is not our Sanhedrim ſtill " a court of juſtice; and are not the laws of " Moſes the laws of the land? Therefore I ex- " hort you to avoid ſeditious practices; pay that " ſupport to government which juſtice requires " of you, make it your chief ſtudy to regulate " your own conduct, and do not waſte your " time in political queſtions, which have a ten- " dency to foſter a ſpirit of diſcontent and ſedi- " tion." Had Doctor Price ranged himſelf among thoſe Phariſees, he would have received the ſame reproof from our Saviour*.

In ſhort, the ſum of the Doctor's reaſoning about the right to govern from *conqueſt*, *compact*, or *obligation conferred*, is all comprehended in the following propoſition, that no rule, or no mode of ſubjection is rightful and lawful but that founded upon laws made by one's own conſent. This propoſition he vainly imagines is a truth deducible from man's inalienable rights, which inalienable rights, when ſpecified, are de-

* We have ſeen the Quakers, in their laſt truly Scriptural annual letter to their brethren, following our Saviour's example, and giving the ſame rebuke to the ſeditious zealots of the preſent age.

monſtrably

monſtrably found not to belong to man. If this is not a baſeleſs fabrick, I know not what is; and yet, however foundationleſs it be, the ſeditious all run in, to ſhelter themſelves in it.

The Doctor again condeſcends to be pitifully abſurd; and aſks, "How much has been done "by this kingdom for *Hanover?* But no one "will ſay, that on this account we have a right "to make the laws of Hanover; or even to "draw a ſingle penny from it without its own "conſent." So then, when I give an apple out of my orchard to a farmer's boy, he ſtands on the ſame footing of obedience and allegiance as my own ſon! Did Great Britain give the territory of Hanover to the Hanoverians, on condition of their obeying the laws of the Britiſh legiſlature? Does the Doctor ever remember any Hanoverian ſitting in the Britiſh Parliament? Has a Hanoverian a right to the privileges of a Britiſh ſubject, without being naturalized by act of Parliament? Even then he can neither elect nor be elected. The Doctor, in anſwering my queſtions, will find a ſolution of his own. The coloniſts may well be called the ſons of Great Britain; for there are thouſands and ten thouſands in the colonies, fathers and mothers of numerous families, who, if it had not been for lands beſtowed upon them by Britain, would have been old bachelors and old maids. Above a million of ſubjects in the colonies owe their very exiſtence in this world, under God, to the bounty of the Britiſh government.

Dr. Price

Dr. Price opens the *Second Part* of his performance with the following paragraph. "In "the foregoing diſquiſitions, I have, from one "leading principle, deduced a number of con- "ſequences, that ſeem to be incapable of being "diſputed. I have meant that they ſhould be "applied to the great queſtion between this "kingdom and the colonies, which has occa- "ſioned the preſent war with them." Now I hope I have already demonſtrated to the unprejudiced reader, that this leading principle is altogether a falſe principle, taken up by the Doctor from his not diſtinguiſhing the alienable from the inalienable rights of human nature; and from his confounding *legal government* with *abſolute dominion*, that is, the government of man over man, with the government of man over beaſts.

His leading principle upon which he has founded his ſeditious reaſoning, proving a falſehood, I might here ſtop all farther examination of his abſurd opinions, about the political ſubordination of colonies to the ſupreme legiſlature of the ſtate, of which they are members; for in fact the ſubſtance of his pamphlet is already anſwered. But though the Doctor's *baſeleſs fabrick* is now demoliſhed, I hope for my reader's indulgence, while I attempt to beat the ruins to pieces, by refuting in detail his bold averments, which ſeem to proceed from a triple ſource, from vulgar prejudices, partial reading, and ignorance

of

of hiſtory. Hear firſt ſome of his alehouſe prejudices. " We have been uſed," he ſays, " to " ſpeak of the colonies as *our* colonies, and to " think of them as in a ſtate of ſubordination " to us, and as holding their exiſtence in Ame- " rica only for our uſe.—The meaneſt perſon " among us is diſpoſed to look upon himſelf as " having a body of ſubjects in America, and " to be offended at the denial of his right to " make laws for them." If the Doctor had not affirmed this, I ſhould not have thought it poſſible for the meaneſt perſon in this kingdom, to have talked ſuch abſurd language. He puts *our* in Italic; but for what reaſon he himſelf beſt knows; for we ſay *our King* as well as *our colonies*. That the colonies are in a ſtate of ſubordination to the ſupreme legiſlature of the empire, is a moſt conſtitutional truth; but it is a mere abuſe of terms to conclude, that the individuals in the colonies, or the coloniſts collectively, are in ſubordination to the individuals of Great Britain. It ſerves an excellent ſeditious purpoſe to inſinuate ſuch a thing; but the meaneſt perſon in the colonies, if he uſes his own underſtanding, will perceive that he is no more ſubordinate to the higheſt ſubject in Britain, than if he lived in Britain.

Next follows a proof of the Doctor's ignorance of hiſtory. " The caſe of a free " country branching itſelf out in the manner " Britain has done, and ſending to a diſtant " world colonies, which have there, from ſmall " beginnings,

" beginnings, and under free legiſlatures of their " own, increaſed,—is a caſe, which is new in " the hiſtory of mankind." It is new to thoſe who are unacquainted with hiſtory; but the Romans, in the time of the republic, planted a colony at Carthage, another at Narbonne, where the magnificent ruins ſhew it to have been extremely opulent: two others in Corſica, ſome in Illyricum, ſome in Spain, all of which had an internal form of free government by duumvirs, ſenate, and people, reſembling that of Rome. The Romans alſo had no leſs than ten colonies in this iſland of Britain, with powers of ſelf-government. Theſe laſt indeed were planted by the emperors, and not by the free republic; but had they been planted by the republic, the Roman hiſtory ſhews, that they could not conſtitutionally have diſobeyed a law from Rome.

The Doctor begins his firſt ſection of this *Second Part* with another attack upon the Declaratory Act, the words of which, he ſays, in fact declare, " that this kingdom has a right to do " with the colonies what it pleaſes." Here we have another proof of the Doctor's confounding *government* with *abſolute dominion*. I have already explained the conſtitutional meaning of the Declaratory Act; but as the occaſion offers, I ſhall preſent my readers with a little more of our author's ſophiſtry on that ſubject, which appears to be only a repetition of that of the Penſylvavanian

vanian Farmer, nearly in the very words. " If " the Declaratory Act means any thing, it " means, he ſays, that the property, and the " legiſlations of the colonies are ſubject to the " abſolute diſcretion of Great Britain, and ought " of right to be ſo." Any reader acquainted with the Engliſh conſtitution will, upon the leaſt reflection, perceive that it means no ſuch thing. The Doctor ought to have added, *for the beſt well being of the whole community, of which the ſupreme legiſlature is the fitteſt judge*; and then he would have given the true import of the Declaratory Act. " If *any part* of the property of " the coloniſts, he ſays, is ſubject to the diſ- " cretion of the Britiſh legiſlature, *the whole* " muſt be ſo, which it is evident leaves them " nothing they can call their own." This is preciſely a repetition of the ſophiſm of Mr. Locke, which was clearly refuted and ſhewn to be altogether an illogical propoſition, two years ago, in the *Right of the Britiſh Legiſlature to tax the Americam Colonies vindicated*; but the Doctor's partial reading has probably been the occaſion of his bringing it again into view. What would any plain man think of Dr. Price, ſhould he affirm, *If the ſun ſhines upon a part of St. Paul's church, it muſt therefore ſhine upon the whole church*; or *if the Thames riſes on foot in Weſtminſter-hall, it muſt therefore riſe to the top of the roof.* Few men have a greater veneration for the memory of Mr. Locke than myſelf, but that will not make me adhere to him againſt

truth. *Amicus Plato; ſed magis amica veritas.* Here Mr. Locke has evidently nodded, and drawn a conſequence directly againſt the logical maxim, *a particulari ad univerſale non valet conſequentia*; that is, whoever concludes generally from a particular affirmation, reaſons falſely. The Doctor puzzles himſelf about the no-limitation of the authority of Parliament, and concludes, that it has no limits, becauſe thoſe limits have by the conſtitution wiſely never been fixed. According to him the Parliament may graſp and pillage at pleaſure, *for its claim admits of no limitation.* But I affirm the Parliament has not a right to a half-penny of the ſubjects money, unleſs as FIDUCIARY or truſtee for the public. As truſtee or ſovereign ſuperintendant of the welfare of the whole community, it has a right to, *I don't know how much*, from every ſubject of the empire; and none but itſelf is the judge of that *how much*; but to conclude from thence, that it would leave the ſubjects no property, or nothing that *they can call their own*, is not more illogical than it is ſeditious. Twenty Mr. Lockes will not alter the nature of truth. In fact no ſtate on earth, that I have any knowledge of, has ſuch a ſacred regard for private property as the Britiſh ſtate, witneſs our winding roads and irregular ſtreets. But taxes for national defence are public property, and as the ſeditious endeavour to raiſe the cry, that Parliament may ſwallow up all, I will in a few words mention what lengths

lengths it has gone, that we may form ſome conjecture of the future. This nation probably never made greater exertions than during the late war. About fourteen years ago I demonſtrated to the public, that in the laſt year of Mr. Pitt's adminiſtration, the expence of government was 26 millions ſterling, or a million every fortnight, that is, we raiſed about 12, we borrowed 12, and run in arrears about 2 millions. Now what proportion does that bear to the income of the nation? That income may be eaſily demonſtrated to be above 110 millions; therefore this expence of government was not quite five ſhillings in the pound on the whole income; but ſtill it was a moſt dreadful ſituation for the nation, that made peace in the higheſt degree neceſſary. I know but one ſtate that has exceeded us, I mean the Genoeſe, who, when they repulſed the Auſtrians in the war before laſt, probably did it at the expence of ten ſhillings in the pound of their incomes; but I ſuppoſe they thought it well beſtowed, though it was what they could not have long endured. For in a garriſon it is thought an intolerable duty, for the men to be but one night in bed out of two. Conſequently we may well imagine, that ſuch a civil ſituation, including women and children, would ſoon lead to ruin. But leaving future wars to future contingencies, I ſhall conſider our preſent peace eſtabliſhment, civil liſt, and public debt included, which amounts to 11 millions; and this compared to the national income of

110 millions is but one-tenth part, or but two ſhillings in the pound.

Now ſuppoſe the ſupreme legiſlature ſhould aſk of the colonies on the Continent of North America 500,000l. what proportion would that bear to their income? The income of thoſe colonies may be demonſtrated to the above 12 millions a year, conſequently 500,000l. paid in public taxes would only be a twenty-fourth part, or ten pence in the pound. Such is the probable ſtate of parliamentary taxation for the colonies in America; but Dr. Price raiſes it up to an impoſſible ſtate, upon as ſound reaſoning as if he had alledged, the Thames might riſe to the top of Weſtminſter-hall becauſe it has been lately found to riſe a foot in it. Now what becomes of the Doctor's fine queſtion; "what is "it that can give to any people ſuch a ſupremacy over another people, as to leave them no-"thing that they can call their own?" Here we have the Doctor again falling into the miſtake of making the Britiſh ſubjects different people. But paſſing over all that, the principles of the Britiſh conſtitution, when rightly comprehended, plainly ſhew, that the queſtion could only be made by a perſon that does not underſtand thoſe principles, and that the queſtion itſelf has no relation to that conſtitution. The ſame reflection is equally applicable to all the ſeditious reaſoning in the anſwers which the Dr. gives to his own queſtion. It would therefore be waſting my readers time to enter into a minute examination

mination of every ſophiſm, which the Doctor founds upon this abſurd queſtion. Only I cannot help obſerving, that in page 36 he appears to me not only nonſenſical but irreligious, when he ſays, " if in order to preſerve its unity (the " unity of the Britiſh empire) one half of it muſt " be enſlaved to the other half, let it, in the " name of God, want unity." A drunken drayman in the ſtreet could hardly uſe the name of the Supreme Being with greater levity than our author appears here to have done; and it will not injure his reaſoning in the leaſt, to have that phraſe altered in any future edition. We all know, that though in the Britiſh ſtate, as in every other free ſtate on earth, ſubjects aſſiſt to govern ſubjects, yet there is no law of ſlavery in all its code.

In the following page the Doctor gives us another proof of his ignorance of hiſtory. " The " Engliſh, he ſays, came from Germany. Does " that give the German ſtates a right to tax us?" How pitiful is this! Hiſtory ſhews us, that the Saxons, who ſettled in Britain, did not receive their protection nor their modes of government from Germany; and I ſuſpect a Britiſh Saxon could not in Saxony have claimed all the rights of a native. The Doctor's arguments really crumble to pieces in the very handling.

Another example we have of this in his moſt illogical compariſon between a parent ſtate and its colonies, with a natural parent and his iſſue. His compariſon halts in every particular. In the

firſt

firſt place were it true, that a certain period frees dependent ſtates from the laws of the parent ſtate, the colonies, even according to the Doctor's ſyſtem, are not arrived at that period. With man, it is about the fourth part of his natural life; but can the Doctor fix the term of the natural life of a ſtate? The Britiſh ſtate has exiſted 1300 years, and the revolted colonies one with another, not much above one hundred years. The American colonies are certainly the political children of Great Britain, and the Doctor wiſely concludes, that ſome of them have ſhewn themſelves not to be her political children by their revolt; whereas he ought only to have concluded, that they are diſobedient children, and have deſerved chaſtiſement as ſuch.

He graciouſly allows, that the territory of the coloniſts belongs to Great Britain; but he aſks, "did they not ſettle upon it under the "faith of charters, which promiſed them the "enjoyment of all the rights of Engliſh-"men, and allowed them to tax themſelves, "and to be governed by legiſlatures of their "own, ſimilar to ours?" The terms of this queſtion are ſo general and involved as to give it a very ambiguous meaning. Taking it in the large ſenſe which the Doctor's words ſeem to imply, I affirm it is not in the power of any King to grant ſuch charters as beſtow upon communities all the rights of Engliſhmen; for in that ſenſe colonies would be independent ſtates, who might declare war againſt each other, or

againſt

againſt any other ſtates; in ſhort, acting *ſui juris*, and minding each their own intereſts, excluſively of any other, without any ſuperintending controul. But taking the charters in their true meaning of implying a ſubordination to the ſovereign legiſlature, which, till the preſent factious period, was the univerſal acceptation; I ſay, that it has before been evidently proved, by examples in the Engliſh hiſtory, both before and ſince the Conqueſt; *that no charters can exempt from public taxes*, though they ſhould even ſpecify ſuch exemption in expreſs words,: ſee before in page 32) and it has alſo been proved, that by the Britiſh conſtitution public taxes are no voluntary contributions or free gifts to be determined at the will of the giver.

The Doctor, in page 43, enters upon a moſt ſagacious enquiry, and aſks, "Whether, if we "have now the ſupremacy over the colonies, "we ſhall not be equally entitled to it in any "future time?" I anſwer moſt aſſuredly we ſhall, while the majority of the ſtate agree to it. He goes on. "They are now but little ſhort of "half our number. To this number they have "grown from a ſmall body of original ſettlers, "by a very rapid increaſe. The probability is, "that they will go on to increaſe; and that in "50 or 60 years, they will be *double* our num-"ber and form a mighty empire, &c.—In that "period will they be ſtill bound to acknowledge "that ſupremacy over them which we now "claim?"

" claim?" I anſwer, moſt aſſuredly they will, while the majority of the ſtate agree to it.

Before I expoſe the weakneſs of the Doctor's Herculean argument, I will make two obſervations; firſt, *if the coloniſts are now but little ſhort of half our number*, why do not they pay near half our taxes? I have moderately placed their quota at 500,000 pounds, or ten pence in the pound of their general income; but Dr. Price gives reaſons to think they can well afford to pay a great deal more. My ſecond obſervation is, that I believe, whoever computes their future increaſe, from their paſt increaſe, will be greatly out in his reckoning for many reaſons; firſt, as manufactures increaſe among them, country ſettlements, which are the great nurſeries of children, will not be ſo frequent among them; next, when their woods are diminiſhed, their ſources of opulence will diminiſh; for while timber finds a good market, it may, in a manner, be conſidered as a crop of 200 years ſtanding, reaped at one cutting. Again, as their cities increaſe, their luxuries will increaſe, and a preference to a town life will get the better of the natural inclination to leave iſſue, which will of courſe leſſen the uſual proportion of births. All this appears to me the natural courſe of things; and, whatever ſome ſpeculative calculators may think, I ſuſpect the increaſe of population in the colonies will be found to proceed in the ſame proportion as the decreaſe of water running out from a caſk by a hole near the bottom.

tom. The more the colonies increaſe, the more difficult they will find it to increaſe; and whatever may be our wiſhes for the augmentation of their population, that which is moſt natural is always moſt probable.

Let us now examine the flimſineſs of the Doctor's reaſoning, and ſee how he has bewildered himſelf in his ſagacious enquiry. The concluſions to be drawn from the following practical caſe will illuſtrate both. Three or four centuries hence, let us ſuppoſe the population of the Britiſh ſtate may amount to 45 millions, namely, 15 millions in Europe, and 30 millions in America. By the territory in Europe, I mean Britain and Ireland; and I ſuppoſe the 30 millions in America, diſtributed in the following manner, 28 colonies on the Continent of a million of inhabitants each, a confederated nation like Ireland of one million, which I ſhall ſuppoſe to conſiſt of the five Indian tribes, whom I could wiſh to ſee chriſtianized and civilized, rather than extirminated and rapaciouſly robbed of their territory. The remaining million of Britiſh ſubjects I place in the ſugar iſlands. I ſhall ſuppoſe all theſe ſubjects living in harmony and peace, with a moſt powerful force for ſelf-defence at the direction of a ſupreme legiſlature, reſident ſomewhere, ſuppoſe in Great Britain. At length ſome ſeditious ſpirits, in one of the colonies, like the Phariſees in the time of our Saviour, diſcover that the members have no relation with the head, and, aſſiſted by ſome Dr.

Price, inſtigate as many of their fellow-ſubjects as they can to a revolt, by dinning into their ears the words *liberty* and *ſlavery*, the meaning of which they take care to miſrepreſent, and by reminding them of the glorious aſſociation of 13 colonies in the year 1775. The ſober-minded, on the other hand, ſay, when one is in health, it is madneſs to be taking phyſic; your repreſentation of liberty and ſlavery is calumnious and falſe; will this intended revolt better our condition? the hiſtory of the eighteenth century ſhews us, that the one factious colony got twelve others who miſapprehended their own privileges, to dance to their pipe, yet they all paid ſo dear for the muſic, that even their children ſuffered for their folly. Let us ſuppoſe that theſe prudent remonſtrances had no effect, and that ten, or twelve, or even fifteen millions were mad enough to have recourſe to arms; yet what would their ſtrength be againſt the remaining thirty millions, who diſapproved of their project? That all the colonies would not be of one mind *then*, may juſtly be preſumed from their not being all of one mind *now*; for, independent of the well-affected ſcattered in the revolted colonies, we have the very honourable example of one entire colony on the Continent directly diſapproving of the rebellious ſentiments of others now in arms, for they do not know what. This difference of ſentiments among the different colonies may be preſumed from another reaſon. The revolters, with the Doctor's project of *forming a mighty em-*

pire

pire, could not diſſemble, but the new empire muſt have a head; the colonies, therefore, where this head was not to be fixed, would ſtill remain members, and conſequently the connection of many of them, with the uſual ſeat of government, might have ſuch a ſtrong influence upon them as to make them rival and contemn the new ſeat of government. Again, ſuch a revolution could not happen without great numbers of people of rank and fortune ſeeing themſelves over-topped by perſons who had been their inferiors, and it may therefore be preſumed, that thoſe people would exert themſelves to maintain the eſtabliſhed government, in order thereby to maintain their uſual rank and influence. From all theſe reaſons we may conclude, that the Britiſh ſtate may continue without being diſmembered for ages to come, with as much virtue in Great Britain three hundred years hence as now, notwithſtanding all the Doctor's gloomy *mays* and *may nots*.

What extent empires may have to the beſt well-being of the ſubjects that compoſe them, is a problem, the ſolution of which exceeds Dr. Price's abilities or mine; and it is a problem which I ſuſpect will never be reſolved. The Otaheitians, I ſuppoſe, imagine no ſhip can be built larger than Capt. Cooke's frigate; but we know by experience that veſſels may be conſtructed four times as large; and there we ſtop. Archimides, however, from his own experience, could have aſſured us that veſſels might be built four times as large as our firſt-rates; but how much

larger is ſtill a queſtion; for what is the utmoſt ſtrength and ſize that ſcantlings and frame-work will admit of, has never yet been aſcertained. It is with empires as with ſhips of war; whenever there is not ſtrength to keep the pieces together, they muſt fall aſunder.

In the ſecond edition of the Second Part, the Doctor profeſſes to treat of the queſtion, *whether the war with America is juſtified by the principles of the conſtitution*; but what I have above ſaid anſwers this completely; for it is one of the principles of our conſtitution, *that any number of ſubjects, not the majority of the ſtate, who ſeek to redreſs their own grievances by a hoſtile reſiſtance to government are always legally puniſhable by government.* Our author ſays, his principal intention in this ſection was to make the following obſervation, "the right of the people, (it ſhould be, "I think, *the people*) to give and grant their "own money, is the fundamental principle of "our government." Moſt aſſuredly that propoſition expreſſes a fundamental principle of our government. But it is the people collectively in the ſupreme legiſlative aſſembly, and not the people individually, nor the people in ſmall communities; for that would imply the following abſurdity, that ſuch an individual, or ſuch a community might give ſuch an aſſiſtance to the ſtate as he or they thought fit, or none at all, *if they pleaſed.* In this caſe, I ſuſpect ſome of the colonies would adopt ſentiments ſomewhat ſimi-

lar

lar to that of the late Queen Dowager of Spain, who ordered in her will, that when ſhe died ſhe ſhould be buried with her late huſband; but ſhe added, *ſhe would rather not die at all.* The ſimple truth is, that in the Britiſh conſtitution, the people by their collective aſſembly make a PART OF THE RULING POWER, and in that capacity originate the public ſupplies, which are DEMANDED by the ruling power from all the ſubjects. This ſimple and evident truth ſhews the great abſurdity of the Doctor's queſtion, " Can we with " any decency pretend, that when we give to the " King *their* money we give him *our* own?" This ſeems to be a tranſcript from the Eſſay of the Philadelphian Farmer, and has been refuted above a year ago. By an abuſive application of the words *the King*, *we*, *their*, and *own*, the Doctor here confounds a very plain propoſition; for his queſtion, conſtitutionally amended, amounts to this, *can the legiſlature pretend, when it demands national ſupplies from the ſubjects, that it demands theſe ſupplies from the ſubjects.* To be ſure there are ſome in the eaſt, and others in the weſt, but they are all equally ſubjects, upon an equality, as far as phyſical neceſſity admits, and the old eſtabliſhed forms of the conſtitution, or rather the eſſential form of the conſtitution. *The giving to the King*, I have plainly demonſtrated above, is not what it was before the Revolution. It is now according to our conſtitution a giving to the nation; and the taxes are called the King's taxes, in the ſame ſenſe that the

the ſhips of war are called the King's ſhips. Should the colonies give twelve ſhips of war to the King, in Dr. Price's ſenſe of giving, I doubt very much whether the Parliament would allow of it.

The Doctor entitles his next ſection, *Of the policy of the War with America*; but inſtead of making his reaſoning correſpond to the title, he indulges himſelf for ſeven pages together, in a vein of ſeditious declamation, intermixed with very many incoherent political apophthegms that might ſtand nearly as well in any other part of his book, as where they are placed. At length he takes himſelf up, and acknowledges that he has wandered a little from the point he intended principally to inſiſt upon. Among his ſcattered apophthegms I meet with the following. "All "government, even *within* a ſtate, becomes ty- "rannical as far as it is a needleſs and wanton "exerciſe of power.—This is what an excellent "writer calls GOVERNING TOO MUCH." In governing diſtance provinces an attention to this remark, he ſays, is extremely neceſſary. I conjecture he means, that miſgovernment may ariſe from *governing too much*. But may not miſgovernment alſo ariſe from governing too little? I will venture to ſay, that the preſent miſrule in the American colonies has ariſen from the latter cauſe. If former adminiſtrations had done their duty, the preſent diſturbances, in all probability, would not have happened. Have not the well-

affected

affected in America been calling out for protoc-tion theſe ten years? Have not riots and diſor-ders been numberleſs during that time. Have not evil-doers, to whom government ought to have been a terror, been exulting and triumph-ing in the very face of their governors? Our rulers at home too ſecurely imagined, that ſince the laſt peace, there was not a ſpot on the ſurface of the globe where the inhabitants had greater reaſon to be contented and happy than in the Britiſh American colonies, if perfect ſecurity and a rapid afflux of wealth are inducements to hap-pineſs. But that afflux of wealth, joined to the inſtability of government at home, brought on preſumption, which broached novel and uncon-ſtitutional opinions; and theſe opinions the de-luded coloniſts are now maintaining with the with the ſword, while their factious abettors are maintaining them here by ſophiſtry. This ſo-phiſtry may be mere play to our orators at home; but it may be death to the poor coloniſts in America; therefore my compaſſion for thoſe coloniſts, and my regard for the public tranqui-lity, has made me undertake to expoſe the falſe reaſoning of Dr. Price, and to illuſtrate the true principles of the Britiſh conſtitution, upon which, in the capital points, our governors have hitherto acted, though not always with that vi-gour they ought. For the maintenance of peace and good order in the colonies requires that our rulers ſhould rather *govern a little more.*

Another

Another of the Doctor's poſitions is, that the war againſt the rebel coloniſts "is "a conteſt from which no advantages can poſ- "ſibly be derived?" What! neither to the ſtate nor to the rebels: what a ſtrange kind of war it muſt be? Thus he reaſons on his own poſition. "Not a revenue. For the pro- "vinces of America, when deſolated, will af- "ford no revenue; or, if they ſhould, the ex- "pence of ſubduing them and keeping them in "ſubjection will much exceed the revenue.— "Not any of the advantages of trade: for it is "a folly next to inſanity to think trade can be "promoted by impoveriſhing our cuſtomers, "and fixing in their minds an everlaſting ab- "horrence of us.——It remains *therefore*, that "this war can have no other object than the ex- "tenſion of power." This the Doctor may perhaps call reaſoning; but it appears to me ſuch reaſoning as that of the ſchool-boy, who ſaid the colour of his coat was not black, nei- ther was it red, *therefore* it was yellow. As to his firſt poſition, that when the rebels are ſub- dued, the colonies will yield no revenue, the futility of it is evinced by hiſtory and fact. Ireland, in the rebellion of 1641, was twenty times more deſolated than, it is to be hoped, the colonies will be by the preſent war; yet it is only ſince that rebellion that Ireland has afford- ed a revenue for maintaining its own internal tranquillity, beſides large ſuccours to the gene- ral defence. I except the two or three turbu-

lent,

lent years in the beginning of King William's reign. But the keeping the colonies in ſubjection, he thinks, will coſt more than they can yield as a revenue. On this I need only obſerve, that it is not the intention of government to keep the colonies in ſubjection. Government wants only to quell the rebels, in order that the coloniſts may enjoy their former freedom; and expects that they ſhould aſſiſt in governing and defending themſelves according to the fundamental law of the ſtate. For a refutation of the laſt clauſe of the Doctor's reaſoning, we need only again appeal to the hiſtory of Ireland, the trade of which iſland with Great Britain is by many degrees more extenſive now, than it was an hundred and fifty years ago. Becauſe the hearts of rebels are full of animoſity, does it follow that the minds of peaceable ſubjects are the ſame?

Having beſtowed this notice upon one or two of the Doctor's digreſſional apophthegms, I ſhall again join him where he leaves off his wandering. In page 58 he returns to the point he intended, he ſays, principally to inſiſt upon in this ſection; and tells us, that the American war is impolitic, becauſe it has given occaſion for calling into queſtion points of authority and prerogative, which are always likely to ſuffer by diſcuſſion. Now here I doubt not but my readers will differ entirely from the Doctor. Did the prerogative of the people of England *not to have their private property touched by the executive power*,

ſuffer at all by the diſcuſſion of Mr. Hampden? It is of the very nature of truth never to ſuffer by diſcuſſion; and thoſe that want to attack her, firſt throw a cloak over her, and then calumniate her. Falſe prerogatives indeed will always ſuffer by diſcuſſion, of which we have before ſeen examples in Dr. Price's not diſtinguiſhing the alienable from the inalienable rights of man, in his deeming *rank ſlavery* what St. Paul dignifies with the name of *freedom*, in his abſurd axiom, that *all taxes are free gifts, &c.*

The Britiſh government muſt be unſtable indeed, if its authority and prerogatives will not bear diſcuſſion; and this very American war, though otherwiſe moſt diſagreeable, has been productive of one advantage in giving occaſions of vindicating the juſt rights of government, which the more they have been attempted to be ſhaken, the more they have been found to be firmly ſupported by truth. And while government has that ſupport, it will ever degrade itſelf by having recourſe to the means of corruption; and yet this very means in this very page the inconſiſtent Dr. Price inſinuates as the beſt method of governing the colonies. Had government abſtained from taxing the colonies, "luxury, he ſays, and, together with it, their dependence upon us, and our influence in their aſſemblies, would have increaſed, till in time perhaps they would have become as corrupt as ourſelves." He adds in a note; "This has been our policy with reſpect to the people of

"*Ireland*,

" *Ireland*, and the conſequence is, we now ſee " their Parliament as obedient as we can wiſh." I doubt not but many of the popular leaders in America ſee a great deal of reaſon in this ſyſtem of Dr. Price's, and are ready for the golden ſhower; but our government, not quite ſo corrupt as our author would ſeem to wiſh them, have ſcorned that expedient, and went upon the fundamental law of the ſtate, *that every ſubject is bound to ſupport government, not as he pleaſes, but according to the will of the ſupreme legiſlature.* For adhering to this truth what abuſe and railing have they not ſuſtained; but all the railing in the world will not prevent the ſun from riſing, nor invalidate the rights of truth.

Before I proceed farther, I am tempted to ſhew my readers where Dr. Price rather ſeems, in the heat of his zeal, to forget his own principles, and to write againſt himſelf. " Our go- " vernors, he ſays, ever ſince I can remember, " have been jealous that the colonies, ſome time " or other, would throw off their dependence. " This jealouſly was not founded on any of their " acts and declarations." From hence, I think, we may conclude, that it is Dr. Price's opinion, this jealouſy of our governors was altogether groundleſs. How our governors have ſpoken and acted, I cannot take upon me to ſay; but moſt of my readers, I believe know, that the dependence of the colonies on Great Britain has been a point often agitated by ſpeculative politicians both in America and in Europe, ſome de-

claring for the affirmative, and ſome for the negative. Here the Doctor, I ſay, ſeems to declare for the negative; but if we turn back to pages 43 and 44 of his pamphlet we find him pompouſly eſpouſing the affirmative. "The probability is, ſays he, that the colonies will go on "to increaſe; and that in 50 or 60 years, they "will be *double* our number and form a mighty "empire, conſiſting of a variety of ſtates, all "equal or ſuperior to ourſelves in all the arts "and accompliſhments which give dignity and "happineſs to human life." I may perhaps have miſapprehended our author, therefore I pray my readers not to give their verdict till they hear what he has to ſay, to reconcile theſe two ſeemingly oppoſite opinions.

I muſt next obſerve, that the Doctor inſtead of adhering to the title of his ſection, again makes another digreſſion of ſix pages, to give an hiſtorical recital of the different acts of adminiſtration, in regard to the colonies, for ſeveral years paſt, which acts are pretty freſh in moſt people's memories, and may be found in any collection of Magazines, without the party tincture the Doctor has given them. As this retroſpective view ſeems only thrown in as a make-weight to the Doctor's diſcourſe, and has hardly any manner of connection with the argument of his ſection, the expoſition of the different falſities ſcattered through it is of little importance. I ſhall only make a few remarks upon the Doctor's ſally againſt the conciliatory motion offered

laſt

laſt ſeſſion of Parliament. "A propoſal, he "ſays, was ſent to the colonies, called conciliatory; and the ſubſtance of which was, that "if any of them would raiſe ſuch ſums as ſhould "be demanded of them by taxing themſelves, "the Parliament would forbear to tax them.— "It will be ſcarcely believed hereafter, that ſuch "a propoſal could be thought conciliatory. It "was only telling them; *if you will tax your-"ſelves* BY OUR ORDER, *we will ſave ourſelves "the trouble of taxing you.* They received the "propoſal as an inſult, and rejected it with diſ-"dain." We have ſeen before, that by the Britiſh conſtitution, it is the ſupreme legiſlature that demands public taxes from the ſubject, and not individuals and ſmall communities that offer thoſe taxes at their pleaſure. On this conſideration I doubt not but my readers, notwithſtanding the new code of laws endeavoured to be palmed upon us by Dr. Price and the Penſylvanian delegates, will perceive that the conciliatory motion is moſt ſtrictly conformable to the real principles of our conſtitution, and ought never to be abandoned by government, but when government abandons the colonies.

If the colonies mean to contribute any thing at all to the immediate ſupport of the ſtate, this conciliatory motion in its very nature removes all pretences for cavilling, or for apprehenſion of vexations. And moſt aſſuredly, to decide of the HOW MUCH can never belong to colonies. The objection, that the ſupreme legiſlature,

were

were it to be ever ſo zealous to act equitably, cannot judge how much the colonies can afford to pay, is a very weak and futile ſubterfuge; for, thanks to the moſt ingenious Sir William Petty, and other calculators, the potency of ſtates, and of communities that are not ſtates, is now computable, and is not ſuch a dark problem to the moderns as it was to our anceſtors. I have computed, that a direct revenue of 500,000l. from the continental colonies would be about ten pence in the pound of their general income; but where is the mighty wrong or grievance ſhould there be an error of one penny, or two pence in the pound on the whole calculation?

Contraſts, when well managed, are allowed generally to add to the beauty of a picture; and the Doctor, after giving a caricatured *drawing* of the proceedings of government, in reſpect to the colonies, oppoſes to it a repreſentation of the conduct of the colonies in the character of ſubjects. The outline of this repreſentation, almoſt in every particular, varies from truth, but it will ſufficiently prove to my readers what a *political deſigner* he is, to remark upon two of the enormities of this outline. Why ſhould the poor coloniſts be aſked to pay taxes to the ſtate; for Dr. Price tells us, that, "by purchaſing our goods "they paid taxes." This argument he uſes ſeriouſly! But if that be the way of paying taxes, the learned and ingenious Dr. Tucker has ſhewn that the Germans pay more of our taxes than the

the coloniſts; for they purchaſe more of our goods.

Again, he ſays, "all the gains of the coloniſts "centered among us." By *us*, I ſuppoſe he means the people of Great Britain; and in that caſe I affirm, that the propoſition, though advanced before by Dr. Franklin and Governor Pownal, is a groſs falſehood, which ſhews, that the affirmers of it either meant to miſlead by ſophiſtry, or did not give the ſlighteſt attention to what they were writing about. I ſhall ſuppoſe the following to be the ſtate of the trade between Great Britain and her American colonies; that we exported the value of 3,000,000l. and only received in commodities the value of 2,000,000l. in return; and that the remaining million was paid us in gold. This laſt million would have the good effect of augmenting our ſpecie at home. But how did the coloniſts get this laſt million in gold? Only by ſending their products and commodities to foreign nations that wanted them; ſo that the ſtate of the trade is ſtill reducible to this: the colonies receive three millions worth from Great Britain, and ſend three millions worth in return, one million of which takes a round-about paſſage, and is a commodity of ſo unperiſhable a nature that it may be kept three or four thouſand years without ſpoiling. This has moſt ſagaciouſly been called, *ſending all the gains of the colonies to Great Britain.* But what are the gains of the colonies? The lands that they now occupy, with the houſes

on

on thoſe lands, with the ſtocks of cattle, and valuable houſehold furniture, are worth more to them than one hundred millions ſterling; and their annual income from thoſe lands, joined to their own induſtry, exceeds twelve millions ſterling. I know I have greatly under-rated not only the capital ſtock, but the income; and both theſe, before this mad revolt, were rapidly augmenting every day. But ſince ſeditious principles have been ſo unreſtrainedly propagated, not only by diſgraced miniſters and place-hunters, but by preachers of the goſpel, unacquainted both with the doctrines of the Bible, and the fundamental laws of the Britiſh conſtitution, many of the coloniſts, as might naturally be expected, have affected to forget from whom they have had thoſe lands, and who have protected them in the quiet enjoyment of them, and in the enjoyment of the ſame liberties, which the generality of the natives of Great Britain enjoy. Very many of the coloniſts, however, I am fully perſuaded, ſtill remain untainted, and will aſſiſt in reſtoring that tranquility with which their land was bleſſed before the preſent diſturbances.

The Doctor having his head ſtill full of the falſe idea, *of all the gains of the colonies, being ſent to Great Britain*, continues his candid ſtrictures in the following manner. "Not content-
"ed with drawing from the colonies a large re-
"venue *indirectly*, we have endeavoured to pro-
"cure one *directly* by an authoritative ſeizure.—
"Vile policy! What a ſcourge is government

"ſo

" ſo conducted!" Here his zeal ſeems *quite* to have run away with his penetration; for we have ſeen that the *authoritative ſeizure* he ſpeaks of is in the very eſſence of the ſupreme legiſlative power. And as to the ſcourges of the Britiſh government, let us hear the Doctor's own account of them, two pages after. " The colo-
" nies, he ſays, taken one with another, dou-
" ble their own number in twenty-five years.—
" Such an increaſe was, I believe, never before
" known. It demonſtrates THAT THEY MUST
" LIVE AT THEIR EASE, and be free from thoſe
" cares, oppreſſions, and diſeaſes, which depo-
" pulate and ravage luxurious ſtates." This happy life of the coloniſts, expreſſed by the Doctor *by their living at their eaſe, free from cares*, plainly comprehends nine years (from 1764 to 1773) of the time that he ſuppoſes government has been ſcourging them, from whence, I think, we may ſafely conclude, that the ſcourges have been very light. And, indeed, how could they be otherwiſe, for the ſtamp-act only aſked about 100,000l. out of an income of 12 millions, which is about two pence in the pound of that income.

In the very next ſentence to that above quoted, page 71, the Doctor diſplays the moſt profound ignorance of the nature of commerce, and particularly of the commerce of the colonies. " With the population of the colonies, he ſays,
" has increaſed their trade; but much faſter,
" on account of the gradual introduction of lux-

" ury among them." Here we have the effect moſt ignorantly ſubſtituted for the cauſe; for the rapid progreſs of the trade of the colonies is ſo far from being owing to their luxury, that their luxury is owing to that rapid progreſs. In communities that have not had a long eſtabliſhment, and that have ſtocks to form, I deny that luxury can be a laſting and permanent cauſe of a progreſſive increaſe of trade. Should the inhabitants of ſuch communities run upon luxury, they might indeed riot for a few years, at the end of which they would find their fund melting from under them, and themſelves ſinking into diſtreſs. The reverſe has been the happy ſituation of the Britiſh coloniſts, becauſe there were other cauſes operating among them different from luxury, though luxury in the end became an *effect* of thoſe cauſes.

Let us firſt ſuppoſe, that the trade of the colonies doubles every twenty-five years, that increaſe of trade is ſo far from being owing to luxury, that it is owing to the very contrary, to oeconomy. We have ſeen, that in the ſpace of twenty-five years their population has doubled; that is the number of families has doubled. But theſe new families, or *menages*, as the French call them, imply the number of houſes being doubled, the quantity of houſehold furniture nearly doubled, the quantity of live-ſtock augmented, and a much greater quantity of land made to be productive; while the families before eſtabliſhed, ſtill continue to be progreſſively more

more rich, and the lands before cultivated to be more valuable; all which united doubles the trade of the whole within the above-mentioned period, by induſtry and oeconomy, and not by luxury.

But the accounts of the exports and imports ſhew us, that the trade of the coloniſts has increaſed much faſter than their population, and this the Doctor ignorantly attributes to the introduction of luxury among them. Will his *ipſe dixit*, however, or confident aſſertion ſuffice for a proof with the diſcerning reader? He indeed, ſeems to be perfectly perſuaded that it will, his performance is ſo full of ſhort dogmas ſtanding without any proof, very ſimilar for their truth and peremptorineſs to the two I firſt took notice of, "that in a free ſtate every man is his "own legiſlator; all taxes are free gifts, &c." The trade of the coloniſts, like the trade of all nations, is owing to the productiveneſs of their lands, joined to their own induſtry; but if their lands are extremely productive, as we know thoſe of the Carolinas and Virginia are, if the ſupreme legiſlature of the ſtate, from a blameable inattention, demands no taxes from the colonies, and grants bounties in their favour, the operation of which may procure them preferable markets, even in competition with the merchants of other parts of the empire; the natural conſequence is, that the huſbandmen and merchants in the colonies may be gaining *cent. per cent.* while the huſbandmen and merchants

in Great Britain are gaining perhaps but 15 *per cent.* by the ſame traffic; and the coloniſts not knowing what to do with the wealth that is flowing in upon them ſo abundantly, act like wiſe men, and give vent to a part of it in luxury. Government has ſo ſcourged them that *they live at their eaſe, and are free from thoſe cares, oppreſſions, and diſeaſes which depopulate and ravage luxurious ſtates*; though they may nevertheleſs venture to taſte a little of luxury as a pleaſing gratification of life.

The Doctor, after indulging himſelf in ſome lugubrious declamation, proceeds to view his ſubject, as he ſays, in a new light; but whether this be a true light or a falſe light my readers will ſoon judge. He begs leave to give a *diſtinct* account of the preſent SINGULAR ſituation of this kingdom; he means, though he does not expreſs it, in regard to the quantity of money both real and nominal, in regard to the national credit, the balance of trade, and the public revenue. He advances many erroneous opinions upon all thoſe points; ſo that on the whole, his *diſtinct* account may be ranked among the moſt *indiſtinct* that have appeared for a long time paſt. His deſultory obſervations on real and nominal money, and on public credit, give not the leaſt new uſeful information upon a ſubject that has been ſcrutinized with much more judgment by Sir James Stewart, Mr. Hume, and other writers, ſome of whoſe ſentiments the Doctor barely repeats in a miſerable, disjointed, incorrect

rect ſtyle. But let us ſee more particularly how lamely, nay how factiouſly and ſeditiouſly our author treats of the above mentioned points.

I ſhall firſt arrange ſome of his propoſitions relating to real and nominal money and public credit. " The whole ſpecie of the kingdom is " probably at this time about fourteen or fifteen " millions.—Coin is the baſis of our paper cre- " dit:—As far as in any circumſtances ſpecie is " not to be procured in exchange for paper, it " repreſents *nothing*, and is worth *nothing*.— " The ſpecie of this kingdom is generally be- " lieved to be inconſiderable, compared with the " amount of the paper circulating in it; and " therefore it is natural to enquire how its cur- " rency is ſupported.——It is ſupported in the " ſame manner with all other bubbles. Were " all to demand ſpecie in exchange for their " notes, payment could not be made.—Were " our public credit annihilated, it would be- " come impoſſible to pay the taxes. The re- " venue would fail. Near a hundred and for- " ty millions of property would be deſtroyed. " The whole frame of government would fall to " pieces, and a ſtate of nature would take place. " What a dreadful ſituation! It has never had " a parallel among mankind except at one time " in France by the breaking of the Royal Miſ- " ſiſſippi Bank. Happily for that kingdom " they have ſhot this gulph. Paper credit has " never ſince recovered itſelf there; and their " circulating caſh conſiſts now all of ſolid coin.

" —This

" —This gives them unſpeakable advantages,
" and joined to that quick reduction of their
" debts, which is inſeparable from their very
" nature, places them on a ground of ſafety
" which we have reaſon to admire and envy.—
" Their debts conſiſt chiefly of money raiſed on
" annuities on lives, ſhort annuities, anticipa-
" tions of taxes for ſhort terms," &c.

Such is the abſtract of his *diſtinct* account of the ſituation of the kingdom in regard to the above mentioned points, from whence he concludes, we ought to tremble for the danger of the nation, and that when rioters aſſemble in an hoſtile manner, and will not hearken to the remonſtrances of the magiſtrate, he ought not to think of quelling them, but of *retreating*. Now a few words will ſuffice to ſhew that his account is erroneous, is partial, in wholly omitting to contraſt the ſituation of the rebels in thoſe points, with the ſituation of ſubjects in Great Britain, and is of a very ſeditious tendency.

" The whole ſpecie of the kingdom, he be-
" lieves to be about fifteen millions." But I remember Lord North, upon very ſolid reaſoning, when recapitulating the tranſactions about the recoinage, concluded that the ſpecie of the kingdom was ſeveral millions more. I ſhall however take it only at ſixteen millions, and ſuppoſe the inhabitants of Great Britain eight millions. This will give us a proportion of money of forty ſhillings to each inhabitant. The nominal money, in currency, I ſhall ſuppoſe to be

be four times as much. Let this be the ſituation of Great Britain. Now let us look into the ſituation of the colonies. Among all the rebel coloniſts there is not probably 100,000 l. in ſpecie, which, ſhared among two millions of people, is in the proportion of one ſhilling to each inhabitant. Here we find a difference of forty to one in favour of Great Britain. But the rebels have begun a paper coinage, and ſuppoſing this paper money at two millions, the nominal among them will be to the real as twenty to one, which gives another difference of five to one in favour of Great Britain. I leave the Doctor to compute the advantage in favour of Great Britain by compounding the ratios.

" Coin, he tells us, is the baſis of our paper " credit." Moſt aſſuredly, as rum is the baſis of good punch. Now it appears, that if in Great Britain they make their punch by adding four meaſures of water to one of ſpirit, the rebels are now making theirs by putting twenty waters to one meaſure of ſpirit. Punch drinkers will eaſily decide which is the moſt invigorating.

" As far, he ſays, as *in any circumſtances* ſpe- " cie is not to be procured in exchange for pa- " per, it repreſents *nothing*, and is worth *no-* " *thing*." The firſt thing that ſtrikes here is the inaccuracy of the ſtyle, for according to the common manner of writing, the Doctor's meaning ſhould be that *ſpecie repreſents nothing*; but I ſhall ſuppoſe he means that paper repreſents *nothing*. Then, I ſay, his propoſition is falſe,

and

and of a very ſeditious tendency. Suppoſe I ſhould have a true bond for one thouſand pounds, and upon an emergency, for the Doctor talks *of any circumſtances*, I want to borrow 500l. upon it, but cannot meet with any lender, is my bond therefore *worth nothing?* What ſelf-confidence a man muſt have to advance ſuch palpable nonſenſe! But farther, let us ſuppoſe all the Bankers in London, at the moment when they have the greateſt quantity of paper in circulation, ſhould contrive to ſtop payment, with a view to defraud the holders of their notes, would not Parliament, as in the caſe of the South-Sea Directors, make the eſtates of thoſe Bankers anſwerable for their paper-obligations; and it is no great preſumption to reckon thoſe eſtates equivalent to a capital of ten millions ſterling*. We have indeed lately had experience, that ſome have ventured to coin baſtard bank-notes upon no other fund than their impudence; but in this kind of traffic, as in all others, the maxim muſt be *caveat emptor*, the dealer muſt beware. It would be moſt wretched logic, however, to conclude, as Dr. Price has done, that becauſe one houſe in Oxford-ſtreet had a rotten foundation, therefore all the houſes in London have rotten foundations. When Dr. Price takes upon him to af-

* The policy of throwing out the bill for making Bankers eſtates liable for their debts, appeared to me altogether incomprehenſible. To provide againſt an evil by a previous law, is certainly preferable to the redreſſing it by an ex poſt facto law.

firm,

firm, " that the currency of the paper circulat-
" ing in this kingdom is ſupported in the ſame
" manner with *all other bubbles*," it is evident he dares to make ſuch an affirmation in defiance of common-ſenſe and plain reaſon; but the defiance of the law is rather a little more perilous, though, in fact, not more diſgraceful than the other.

As the paper-money iſſued by the rebels is altogether illegal, I think one may ſafely ſay, that it is a COMPLETE BUBBLE; and thoſe who ſhall be the poſſeſſors of it when peace is reſtored, will find to their coſt, that they poſſeſs what is *worth nothing*. According to the expreſſion of Plautus, " ſuo periculo is emat, qui eam mercabitur."

" Were our public credit annihilated, he
" ſays, it would become impoſſible to pay the
" taxes." By *public credit*, I ſuppoſe he means, the *national debts*, and, in that caſe, I ſay, that this is another falſe and abſurd propoſition. In the firſt place, were the public debts annihilated, that would not ſweep away the twentieth part of our fund; and we ſhould have but little more than half the preſent taxes to raiſe, which (forgetting his preſent aſſertion) he mentions himſelf two pages afterwards, conſequently there would be no difficulty in raiſing them. I have ſaid that the annihilation of our public debts would not ſweep away the twentieth part of our fund, and the following reflections will make that evident. The burden of the public debts

is not in the capital of 124 millions; but in the annual intereſt paid to the public creditors, which we ſhall ſuppoſe is four millions and an half. Now it may be proved, that the preſent annual income of the nation exceeds one hundred millions, therefore ſhould a public bankruptcy take place, the annual income on that account would not be diminiſhed much more than four millions and an half; for all thoſe who were not public creditors might very nearly ſpend in their uſual manner. A fortnight's rain in the corn and hay harveſts, I affirm, would leſſen the national income more than the deficiency of four millions and an half of annual rents. I could enlarge a great deal more upon the ſubject of the national debt; but for many reaſons I judge it prudent to forbear, what I have ſaid being ſufficient to over-turn the Doctor's poſition.

He ſeems to place the ſuppoſed capital of the public debts on the ſame footing with the nominal or paper money circulating through the kingdom, and lumps it all under the name of paper-currency, which, though a common opinion, is extremely erroneous. The public debts are transferable; but ſo are lands and houſes; yet that does not make them money, in the common acceptation of the word. Should I have a great deal of money in a cheſt with two different locks, and only poſſeſs the key of one of thoſe locks, I could not be ſaid to command my money at my pleaſure. This is preciſely the caſe of the national debts. No public creditor can draw

draw his money out of the public funds, unleſs he meets with ſome other perſon ready to put in as much as he draws out: therefore our public debts and funds circulating in the alley cannot properly be called paper-currency; for nearly the ſame quantity of nominal money might circulate in the nation without thoſe debts as with them.

We may now ſee what judgment we ought to form of his terrific threat, "the whole frame of "government would fall to pieces and a ſtate of "nature would take place." Did a ſtate of nature take place after the bankruptcy of the Miſſiſſippi Company in France, which he ſays, "is a parallel caſe to our ſuppoſed national "bankruptcy, though ſomewhat leſs ſevere in "its conſequences there, than a like bankrupt-"cy would be here;" which ſhews that he is but very little acquainted with the ſtate of the two countries. The bankruptcy of the Miſſiſſippi Company in France occaſioned many a tearful eye, and the grand-children and great-grand-children of thoſe creditors who ſuffered, ſtill feel the ſad effects of that breach of faith, which robbed their anceſtors of ample fortunes, that might now have been theirs. But did France, as a community, ſuffer in any great degree by that bankruptcy? Very little more, I believe, than by the loſs of the battle of Blenheim, which occaſioned many a tearful eye in that kingdom likewiſe. Dr. Price therefore ſeems to have been at a loſs for a phraſe, when he affirmed,

that a *ſtate of nature* would follow a public bankruptcy in England. For were a public bankruptcy to happen this year, there would not, in all probability, next year, be one acre of wheat leſs, one load of hay leſs, one yard of cloth leſs, than if ſuch an event had not happened. Neither would the number of horſes, of cattle, of ſheep, be at all diminiſhed. How fantaſtic and wild then muſt that imagination be, which can fancy, that a deficiency of revenue to the amount of four millions and an half, which does not imply a deficiency of ſubſiſtence, would inſtantly bring the inhabitants of this iſland to a *ſtate of nature*. Not only the natural reſources of the nation, but the good faith for which the Britiſh legiſlature has hitherto been diſtinguiſhed, removes all apprehenſions of the Doctor's *ſtate of nature* during the preſent criſis.

" Happily for France, ſays our author, pa-
" per credit has never ſince recovered itſelf in
" that kingdom." This is his opinion; but it is very different from that of many of the beſt of their own political writers, particularly of the author of the eſſay *Sur le Commerce des Grains*, who has ſeveral very judicious ideas upon the advantages that his nation might reap from nominal money, under proper reſtrictions and regulations. The Doctor, with his uſual inaccuracy, leaves his readers to gueſs, whether by the words *paper credit* he means public credit or private credit. " The want of paper-money, join-
" ed to the quick reduction of their debts,
" places

" places the French, he ſays, on a ground of " ſafety, which we have reaſon to admire and " envy." But are there no ſhades at all in this fair picture? I am afraid the Doctor, like ſome of our travellers, has ventured to praiſe a picture he never ſaw. But let me enumerate ſome of the ſhades. The French having no paper-money are *moins pecunieux*, or leſs monied than we are; and certainly money, either real or nominal, is an excellent oil for facilitating the motion of the machine of ſtate; the *perception*, or expence of levying their taxes, is ſo enormous, that it has been computed that of 24 *livres* raiſed upon the people, hardly 12 go into the *coffres du Roi*, or treaſury. The Marquis de Mirabeau goes ſo far as to think the King gets only one third of the *ferme* of tobacco, which he divides in the following manner, 33 millions raiſed upon the people, 11 of which to the King, 11 to the *fermiers generaux*, or contractors for the tax, and 11 to the *commis* for levying it. Here then, on account of management alone, France has an annual burden of above two millions, that Great Britain is exempted from. In a town where we may have three or four exciſemen, the French would have forty revenue officers, ſome for the *gabelle* or ſalt-duty, others for the *aides*, or wine-duty; others for the *taille* or arbitrary tax on land and ſtock; and others for other branches, all unconnected with each other. Great part of their debt likewiſe, though it has not the name of debt, conſiſts in *charges et offices*, or employ-

ments,

ments, moſt of them nominal, paid by the ſtate for money formerly lent to it. The Engliſh reader will have ſome idea of this, if he ſuppoſes 20,000 Juſtices of the peace obliged to pay 1000 l. a piece for their places; for which the government is to allow them 50 l. a year. Some of their miniſters, within theſe few years have made an attempt to remove this burden, but without ſucceſs. On the contrary, ſo ſcanty are the ſupplies of the ſtate, in compariſon of the demands, and ſo low is its credit, that its miniſters, though they have *made* ſeveral LOANS ſince the peace, were obliged within theſe five years to ſtop the payment of all penſions; and monied men, rather than lend to them at 6 *per cent.* lent to monaſteries at the *quarantieme denier*, or two and an half *per cent.* Dr. Price may now, if he pleaſes, *admire and envy the ground of ſafety upon which the French ſtand*, with a perpetual annual incumbrance of near four *millions* a year, which they know not how to ſhake off*.

* In ſome pieces publiſhed a few months ago by Voltaire, under the title of *Lettres Chinoiſes, Indiennes, et Tartares*, he pretends, that France loſes every year 974 millions of livres, or about 42 millions ſterling, by the impolitic and exceſſive mode of taxation on the three articles of ſalt, wine, and tobacco. Voltaire, as a good citizen, would, no doubt, be greatly rejoiced to ſee an ample demonſtration from Dr. Price, *that France ſtands on a ground of ſafety, which England has reaſon to admire and envy.* But I would adviſe Dr. Price to be better acquainted with the ſubject before he undertakes the demonſtration.

The

The war againſt the rebels, the Doctor thinks, may affect the ballance of our trade; but his ſpeculations on that point lead him only to conclude, that it has a tendency to affect that ballance, which ballance is, in its very nature, ſo very complicated, that experience alone can decide. "All know, he ſays, that the ballance of trade "with the coloniſts is greatly in our favour;" and why ſhould it not? But is it not alſo greatly in favour of the coloniſts? I affirm that it is. This may appear a paradox; but upon examination, I believe, will be found to be an evident truth. Let us ſuppoſe a planter in Carolina receives a grant of one hundred acres for the annual quit-rent of half-a-crown, he may eaſily raiſe from that plantation 500 l. worth of rice, which ſent to Italy, or Spain, will ſell for 600 l. and this 600 l. purchaſes manufactures in Great Britain, which coſt the Engliſh merchant only 500 l. Thus the merchants in both countries gain 20 *per cent.* and the coloniſt in Carolina, for what he reaps *in one year* from lands beſtowed upon him by Great Britain, becomes poſſeſſor of as many manufactures, as the ſame hands employed upon his farm, had they been manufacturers, could not have made *in two years.* If this is not profit, I do not know what ought to be called profit; and this accounts for the rapid accumulation of wealth among the coloniſts; yet Dr. Price, Governor Pownal, and Dr. Franklin, tell us, *that the gains of all the coloniſts center*

in

in Great Britain! How long has the nation been bubbled by an ignorant or partial repreſentation of facts!

The Doctor next prognoſticates a deficiency in the revenue from the attempt to reduce the rebels; but he founds this upon his preceding doubtful poſition of the ballance of our trade being affected by that war. But as the ballance of trade veers like the wind, his concluſions, of courſe, are merely conjectural. Should the war in America continue longer than is expected; if, at the ſame time, the fiſheries on our own coaſts become more extenſive; and the ſupply of proviſions to the Weſt Indies proceeds regularly from Great Britain, the nation, notwithſtanding a diminution in the ballance of trade, will find an increaſe of internal vigour, which is ever the chief thing to be attended to, and forms the real ſtrength of kingdoms.

During the continuance of every war, both the contending parties certainly riſk profits as well as lives; and the Doctor, to have argued ſenſibly on the policy of the war with the rebellious coloniſts, ought to have examined candidly, which party run the greateſt riſk. The point of right has already been debated; therefore let us now only aſk, is it politic to urge the right? Is it politic to ſuffer factious ſubjects to take upon them to redreſs their own grievances; and to renounce obedience to government whenever they pleaſe? Is it politic to ſuffer fifty ringleaders to reign as tyrants over the well-affected ſubjects among the coloniſts,

and

and to aſſume to regulate the trade of Great Britain? Becauſe the rebels are very wilful from truth not getting acceſs to them, does it follow from thence that they are very ſtrong? We have ſeen their comparative weakneſs in point of money. It is alſo evident in point of ſhipping. I will venture to ſay, alſo in point of military diſcipline, and moſt certainly in point of numbers. Therefore to parody an expreſſion of our author's, REBELS *on an edge ſo perilous, ſhould think of nothing but ſubmiſſion.*

The Doctor, in his fourth ſection of this ſecond part, propoſes to treat *of the honour of the nation as affected by the war with America.* But ſurely he might have ſaved himſelf that trouble; for if he has proved this kingdom the aggreſſor in an unrighteous quarrel, and that it is impolitic to carry on the war, he need not doubt but every one will agree with him, that it muſt be diſhonourable to purſue it. As he has however moſt miſerably failed in proving the two firſt points, we may therefore conclude, that the honour of the nation is not at all affected by the war againſt the rebels.

Having little to ſay on this ſubject, he again beats over the ſame ground of ſophiſtry about one country and another country, which has already been ſhewn to be an entire miſ-ſtating of the queſtion, as the territory on which the coloniſts are ſeated was acknowledged to be part of the dominion of Great Britain, before any of

them ever poſſeſſed it, and they are every year receiving new grants of that ſaid dominion; and the very principle of all their ſettlements is an obedience to the ſupreme legiſlature of the ſtate.

The Doctor next condeſcends to give us ſome more proofs of his ignorance of hiſtory. "The "united provinces of Holland, he ſays, were "once ſubject to the Spaniſh monarchy;" but by acts of government were driven to reſiſtance.

This is a ſubject that has often been referred to by the ſeditious; and Governor Pownal, I believe, has beſtowed above an hundred pages upon it, with much diſquiſition, but I am ſorry to ſay without much diſcernment. The caſe however is no way parallel with coloniſts refuſing obedience to the ſupreme legiſlature, for the Netherlands never were ſubject to the Spaniſh monarchy, as has been explained to the public above a year ago. They ſtood in the ſame relation to Spain that Hanover ſtands to Great Britain, that is, the heirs of the Duke of Burgundy, in conſequence of marriages, became Kings of Spain. It was ſo common an opinion in Queen Elizabeth's time, and in the beginning of the laſt century, that people belonged to the King or ſovereign, that the popular error of the Netherlands being ſubject to Spain is deſcended from one generation to another. But the Netherlands themſelves knew better; and I have met but with one Engliſh author who has had the good ſenſe to remark the diſtinction. Carew, who wrote his Survey of Cornwall before

Queen

Queen Elizabeth's death, ſays "Philip, Arch-"duke of Auſtria, during his voyage from Ne-"therland to Spain, *his wife's kingdom*, was "weather-driven into Plymouth."

What a precious thing hiſtory is in ſome people's hands! When it makes directly againſt their opinion they can quote it for their opinion. This the Doctor has again done in the caſe of the ſocial war againſt the Romans, by which he ſhews his ignorance both of the Britiſh conſtitution and of the Roman. I will venture to affirm, that the Britiſh coloniſts now in rebellion, enjoyed much more valuable liberties before their revolt than the ſocial confederates obtained, and gladly acquieſced in, after they had experienced all the calamities of war. What did they obtain? That they ſhould be called Roman citizens, and when any of their inhabitants CAME TO ROME, they ſhould have a full right with any other Romans to give their votes for the election of magiſtrates; but to render this nugatory, they were ſo claſſed as to form eight tribes out of forty-three. The conſequence was, that it only augmented the *turba forenſis* and *capite cenſi* at Rome; for the blackguards of the ſocial towns, who could not live at home, acquired ſome importance by reſiding at the capital, where they became the vile inſtruments of every ambitious leader.

The author, who has ſo ignorantly miſapplied two hiſtorical caſes, refers a few pages afterwards to the caſe of Ireland, which he ſeems to under-

ſtand as little as that of the Netherlands, or of the ſocial war. It has been ſhewn in the *Right of the Britiſh Legiſlature vindicated*, that Ireland never was an Engliſh colony. There is this great difference between the Iriſh and the coloniſts, that the Iriſh under Henry II. actually gave their lands to the crown of Great Britain, whereas it is the crown of Great Britain that beſtows lands upon the coloniſts. Had there not been frequent rebellions in Ireland, there might at this moment not have been one thouſand Engliſh families in all that iſland, and the Iriſh language might have been the general language at Dublin; yet that kingdom would ſtill have been under the ſame ſubordination as at preſent.

The Iriſh, as a diſtinct nation confederated with us, may claim privileges different from thoſe of coloniſts; but, on the other hand, the coloniſts as coloniſts, enjoy privileges ſuperior to thoſe of the Iriſh, in being under the immediate ſuperintendance of the ſupreme legiſlature, which has been to them worth many millions; for to that ſuperintendance, the coloniſts, I will venture to ſay, have owed their proſperity and affluence more than to any other cauſe. There has been no wall of partition between them and the ſunſhine of government, from which ſunſhine the Iriſh have been moſt impolitically excluded for theſe hundred years paſt. Several years ago I endeavoured to repreſent both the juſtice and the policy of removing that partition between Great Britain and Ireland, which would moſt certainly promote

promote the proſperity of both iſlands; and it is with the greateſt pleaſure I now ſee that very important object beginning to attract the attention of government*.

The colonies, our author ſays, are perſuaded they are fighting for liberty, and Dr. Price does all in his power to fortify them in that falſe perſuaſion, by arguments founded on a miſtaken theory, and by principles that any knot of ſmugglers or banditti may urge in juſtification of their proceedings. But *I do not like the government, therefore I may oppoſe it*, is a very dangerous logic for any thouſand or hundred thouſand to maintain in the face of eight or ten millions, though it would be very ſound logic in the mouth of the millions. My wiſhes are to ſee the rebel coloniſts conquered by truth, rather than by the ſword; but if they will weakly exclude the promulgation of truth among them, and give a willing ear to falſe and pernicious doctrines, it is not to be wondered

* Dr. Price gives us in a note a maxim of Mr. Mollineux's, from his Caſe of Ireland's being bound by acts of Parliament in England. This golden ſaying is, "I "have no other notion of ſlavery, but being bound by a "law to which I do not conſent;" from whence my readers will naturally conclude, that Mr. Mollineux has been as ignorant of the nature of liberty and ſlavery as Dr. Price has ſhewn himſelf to be. There is much more ſpecious learning than ſound reaſoning in Mr. Mollineux's book, and an excellent refutation of it was publiſhed in 1698, by Mr. Coke of Briſtol, which I would recommend to Dr. Price's peruſal; it is intitled, *The Hiſtory and Reaſons of the Dependency of Ireland upon the imperial Crown of the kingdom of England, rectifying Mr. Mollineux's State of the Caſe, &c.*

that

that they run upon deſtruction. They are however very deſerving of pity; but whether they will one day think their tempters and ſeducers deſerving of thanks, I ſhall leave to their own deciſion. Few of us, I believe, think ourſelves obliged to the ſeducer of Eve, who is the firſt haranguer upon record, that urged the *inalienable right* of man to be his own legiſlator.

The Doctor ſeriouſly advances, that the war againſt the rebels is diſgraceful, becauſe foreign troops are to be employed in it. But for the ſame reaſon all the wars the nation has been engaged in theſe hundred years are diſgraceful. For my own part I am very ſorry that foreign troops are hired, becauſe I think the military force that this nation could afford to raiſe and keep up, would have been ſufficient for quelling the revolters, with the aſſiſtance of another ally, whom we might have had at a cheaper rate. The ally I mean is Time. But the diſcuſſion of this point falls in more properly with the examination of the Doctor's fifth and laſt ſection, which is intitled, *Of the probability of ſucceeding in the War with America.*

I did not know before, that we had been at war with America, any more than with Africa. But I ſuppoſe by America the Doctor means ſome fellow-ſubjects in that part of the world now in arms againſt government; and in that caſe I think there is the greateſt probability of ſucceſs on the ſide of government. This the

Doctor

Doctor himſelf ſhall prove to my readers by his own poſitions, when they are freed from their abſurdities and ſelf-contradictions, and explained by a natural and unforced commentary. " Let " the force, he ſays, employed by government " be 40,000 effective men; the revolters have " half a million of men to oppoſe to it:" according to him therefore " it is a folly ſo great, " that language does not afford a name for it, to " think of conquering that whole continent with " 40,000 men, to be tranſported acroſs the At- " lantic, and fed from hence, and incapable of " being recruited after any defeat."

To view and conſider theſe poſitions diſtinctly, we muſt firſt throw off the rubbiſh from them; for that the troops are to be fed from hence, and incapable of being recruited after any defeat, are mere gratis aſſumptions of the Doctor's. He tells us, that the government army is to be oppoſed by half a million of determined men, fighting on their own ground within ſight of their houſes and families. But how does he form this half a million? By draughting every fourth perſon out of two millions of men, women, and children. This may breed a wonder in a ſchool-boy; but does the author ſeriouſly think ſuch arguments can make any impreſſion but that of contempt upon thoſe who are experienced in life.

All the able bodied men of a country, or in other words, a quarter of the inhabitants, is much more than the half of the ſtrength of a country; and yet we found in the late war only a quarter,

or

or not quite a quarter of our ſtrength or 26 millions, employed every year, was near overwhelming us, and could not have been exerted unleſs artificially on account of our accumulated wealth. Indeed, if the coloniſts will come into the field only with bows and arrows, and paſs the campaign without clothing, and without victuals, one fourth of them may almoſt be counted upon for fighting men. In other reſpects it is ridiculous to reckon the number of their troops that can act offenſively from the number of their men capable of bearing arms. The Ruſſians, towards the end of their late war, made a levy of one man of fifty perſons which was rather reckoned a high proportion. When wars were carried on by tumultuary armies, each man bringing the arms of his own manufacture, made at his own fire-ſide, numerous troops might appear in the field for a few weeks once a year, or once in two years. But as wars are at preſent carried on, a great part of thoſe concerned in them never once appear in the field, but remain at home preparing implements of death, and other neceſſaries for the reſt. Thoſe implements are ſo very expenſive, that the labour of many years muſt go to the preparation of them, and vaſt ſums of money are neceſſary for the purchaſe of the very materials. In this view the arſenals of Woolwich and Portſmouth alone, in aid of ten thouſand men, are a counter-balance for fifty thouſand men ill provided for war. The Doctor may perhaps alledge, that his half a million are

not

not to appear in one field; but to take arms occaſionally as their ſervice is required. In that caſe they ſtand only as a body to recruit from; and, when they take the field, muſt march many hundred miles from the ſight of their own houſes and families. Government, on the other hand, recruits from two millions and an half of able-bodied men in Britain and Ireland, and one million and an half in Germany, in all four millions, which is a ſuperiority of eight to one, beſides the operation of its fleet; and the great preponderancy in its favour by the abundance of warlike ſtores it poſſeſſes. The Doctor I hope will graciouſly allow our fleet to ſtand for ſomething. I ſhall compute its annoyance at only a fifth of the whole. This will make the effective ſtrength of government againſt the rebels 50,000 men, to which if we add thoſe employed at home in co-operating for the ſupply of that force both with men and with ſtores, we may reckon the whole amount to be equivalent to 60,000 men on the field of action. Now as this is not to be a temporary armament, but to be continued unremittingly, till a pacification takes place, it may well be regarded as much more formidable than a tumultuary army of 100,000 men.

What are thoſe 60,000 men to ſubdue? Two millions of people ſcattered over a country as extenſive as all Germany, all Holland and Flanders, and all France, from the mouth of the Elbe on the north, to the Pyrenean mountains on the ſouth; and among thoſe two millions the go-

vernment troops have many thouſands of zealous friends ready to join them. The impoſſibility of recruiting the army is ſuch an abſurdity as anſwers itſelf; and as to the manner of the troops being ſupplied with proviſions, I ſhall only obſerve, that the probability is, they will make their quarters good ſomewhere; and that in the laſt war proviſions were even ſent from England to feed the French army in Weſtphalia; I mean the corn exported from Norfolk was bought by the Dutch and ſold to the French commiſſaries. While Admiral Hawke likewiſe cruiſed in Quiberon Bay, he was ſupplied with water from England, which was computed to have coſt above three pence a quart. All theſe conſiderations induce me to conclude, that the ſtrength which Great Britain can exert would ſuffice, with the aſſiſtance of time, to put an end to the war without foreign aid. But there may nevertheleſs be many moſt ſubſtantial reaſons, which I am unacquainted with, for preferring a great force in a ſhort time to a ſmaller force in a longer time.

Though the Britiſh coloniſts in America are ſcattered over a country as extenſive as all Germany, all Holland and Flanders, and all France; yet Dr. Price, in defiance of the truth of hiſtory, again brings the colonies in compariſon with the Netherlands. "In the Netherlands, he ſays, a "a few ſtates *thus circumſtanced* withſtood for "thirty years the whole force of the Spaniſh "monarchy." Were the ſeventeen provinces of the

the Netherlands *thus circumſtanced*, I mean ſo circumſtanced as our coloniſts? In no ſenſe of theſe words, is the caſe of our colonies to be compared with that of the Netherlands. We have ſeen that in point of *right*, nothing but the groſſeſt ignorance can think there is any relation. Let us now ſee how the parallel holds in point of force. The inhabitants of the ſeventeen provinces were probably double the number of our coloniſts; and inſtead of being ſcattered from the Elbe to the Pyrenean mountains, their force was concentered in a ſmall country full of fortified towns, where not only the report of the cannon might be heard, but the flaſh might be ſeen from one garriſon to another. This country is likewiſe very much interſected by rivers and arms of the ſea, and a great portion of it is nothing but a large ſwamp. The inalienable right of man, in regard to religion, had then been moſt violently invaded all over Europe, which created a moſt bitter animoſity of one half againſt the other, and procured the new Proteſtants of the ſeven confederated Provinces thouſands of friends in England, Scotland, Germany and France. They had all Proteſtant Germany at their back, from whence probably they drew ten thouſand recruits every year. The Queen of England and the King of France each aſſiſted them with a body of troops; and the Scots, who for near two thouſand years have been diſtinguiſhed for their attachment to the military profeſſion, crowded thither in great numbers, as they did

afterwards to the ſtandards of Guſtavus Adolphus, to the number of twenty thouſand. The Netherlanders then, in fact, may be ſaid to have recruited from above twenty millions of people, and from the accumulated wealth of ages had a purſe nearly equal to that of their adverſary. Can then the caſe of the revolted coloniſts in America be paralleled with the leaſt juſtice or the leaſt propriety with that of the Hollanders? I will almoſt appeal even to Doctor Price.

The caſe of the Syracuſans and Greek coloniſts, mentioned by our author, I fancy, will likewiſe be found to be as little applicable as that of the Netherlands. I have not at preſent opportunity to enquire into the nature of the Greek colonies; but I apprehend they were not ſent out with a form of laws to the remote dominions of the parent ſtate under her protection; but were ſent out, as our firſt parents were ſent out of Paradiſe with the world all before them,

——————————— where to chooſe
Their place of reſt, and Providence their guide.

They ſeem to have been ſmall detachments, ſeparated from the parent ſtate, as their name implies, ἀποικοι, or *people from home*; and we find them in Thrace, and in Magna Græcia declaring war and peace with their neighbours, and with each other, which ſoon brought the former under the power of Philip of Macedon, and the latter under the power of the Romans.

The four or five following pages of the Doctor's obſervations are too rich in abſurdities to paſs

paſs them without ſome remarks. " The colo-
" niſts, he tells us, are determined either to give
" up to our reſentment or deſtroy themſelves
" ſuch of their maritime towns as they cannot
" guard againſt our fleets, the conſequence of
" which will be, that theſe towns will be rebuilt
" in ſafer ſituations.—As to their trade having
" all the neceſſaries and the chief conveniences
" of life within themſelves,—the loſs of it will
" do them unſpeakable good." Here then at one ſtroke the Doctor overturns the greateſt part of his pretended reaſoning! The coloniſts are to reap unſpeakable benefits from this war! What are thoſe benefits? I believe ſuch as moſt of the coloniſts would wiſh to be excuſed from. They are a preſervationf om the evils of luxury and the temptations of wealth.

" The reſtraining act, he ſays, will furniſh
" them with a reaſon for confiſcating the eſtates
" of all the friends of our government among
" them." What! if thoſe friends ſhould not take any active part; but as *nonjurors* only refuſe taking the oaths to the new government? That ſurely could not be the country meant by the Doctor's prophecy, " where the friends of liber-
" ty in every quarter of the globe are to find a
" ſafe retreat from civil and ſpiritual tyranny." But my readers are now pretty well acquainted with our author's inconſiſtencies, and therefore I do not expect they will be much aſtoniſhed here. The well-affected to government among the coloniſts have but too many proofs, that what

afterwards to the ſtandards of Guſtavus Adolphus, to the number of twenty thouſand. The Netherlanders then, in fact, may be ſaid to have recruited from above twenty millions of people, and from the accumulated wealth of ages had a purſe nearly equal to that of their adverſary. Can then the caſe of the revolted coloniſts in America be paralleled with the leaſt juſtice or the leaſt propriety with that of the Hollanders? I will almoſt appeal even to Doctor Price.

The caſe of the Syracuſans and Greek coloniſts, mentioned by our author, I fancy, will likewiſe be found to be as little applicable as that of the Netherlands. I have not at preſent opportunity to enquire into the nature of the Greek colonies; but I apprehend they were not ſent out with a form of laws to the remote dominions of the parent ſtate under her protection; but were ſent out, as our firſt parents were ſent out of Paradiſe with the world all before them,

——————————— where to chooſe
Their place of reſt, and Providence their guide.

They ſeem to have been ſmall detachments, ſeparated from the parent ſtate, as their name implies, αποικοι, or *people from home*; and we find them in Thrace, and in Magna Græcia declaring war and peace with their neighbours, and with each other, which ſoon brought the former under the power of Philip of Macedon, and the latter under the power of the Romans.

The four or five following pages of the Doctor's obſervations are too rich in abſurdities to paſs

paſs them without ſome remarks. "The colo-
"niſts, he tells us, are determined either to give
"up to our reſentment or deſtroy themſelves
"ſuch of their maritime towns as they cannot
"guard againſt our fleets, the conſequence of
"which will be, that theſe towns will be rebuilt
"in ſafer ſituations.—As to their trade having
"all the neceſſaries and the chief conveniences
"of life within themſelves,—the loſs of it will
"do them unſpeakable good." Here then at one ſtroke the Doctor overturns the greateſt part of his pretended reaſoning! The coloniſts are to reap unſpeakable benefits from this war! What are thoſe benefits? I believe ſuch as moſt of the coloniſts would wiſh to be excuſed from. They are a preſervationf om the evils of luxury and the temptations of wealth.

"The reſtraining act, he ſays, will furniſh
"them with a reaſon for confiſcating the eſtates
"of all the friends of our government among
"them." What! if thoſe friends ſhould not take any active part; but as *nonjurors* only refuſe taking the oaths to the new government? That ſurely could not be the country meant by the Doctor's prophecy, "where the friends of liber-
"ty in every quarter of the globe are to find a
"ſafe retreat from civil and ſpiritual tyranny." But my readers are now pretty well acquainted with our author's inconſiſtencies, and therefore I do not expect they will be much aſtoniſhed here. The well-affected to government among the coloniſts have but too many proofs, that what

what furniſhes them reaſons for thankfulneſs has furniſhed the rebels reaſons for outrage; but Dr. Price's hint, I hope, will furniſh reaſons to our rulers for confiſcating the eſtates of thoſe who have taken an active part in the preſent rebellion.

The reſtraining act, he tells us, rendering their ſhips (conſiſting of *many* hundreds) uſeleſs, they will be turned into ſhips of war. With how much eaſe the Doctor gives them a navy ſuperior to that of Great Britain, who contents herſelf with little more than a couple of hundreds of ſhips of war. But where are all the ſhips of the rebels to come from; for he has told us that their defenceleſs maritime towns, which we did not deſtroy, they themſelves are to deſtroy. He may perhaps allege, that their new maritime towns will be high up upon navigable rivers. It may be ſo; but I think it is probable that if their ſhips can get out, our ſhips may get in. He may ſtill anſwer, that he does not reaſon much upon probabilities; and to this I have no reply.

The loſs of their trade, and the having all their ports ſhut up, which he tells us from his own certain knowledge has long been the wiſh of the wiſeſt men among the coloniſts, according to him, is to prepare the way for their quickly becoming a great maritime power, aye, and much more than he has words to expreſs. This reflection awakens in him ſome kind of a religious ſentiment, which I ſhall give my readers, involved in his own ambiguous words. "None, he ſays, who know me, can believe

" me to be diſpoſed to ſuperſtition. Perhaps, " however, I am not, in the preſent inſtance, " free from that weakneſs.—I fancy I ſee in " in theſe meaſures, ſomething that cannot be " accounted for merely by human ignorance. " I am inclined to think, that the hand of Pro- " vidence is in them working to bring about " ſome great ends." Wonderful ſuperſtition! Who that believes a ſuperintending Providence is not FIRMLY PERSUADED that the proſperity and calamity of nations, and the revolutions of ſtates are under the influence and direction of the infinitely ſupreme Power; but our author only *fancies he ſees*; and thinks an apology neceſſary for his ſuperſtitious weakneſs.

The Doctor before he concludes, recapitulates ſome of his arguments, which he means to give very ſharp and pointed; but whether they are penetrating my readers may judge. " I am " hearing it, he ſays, continually urged, *are* " *they not our ſubjects?*—The plain anſwer is, " they are not your ſubjects. The people of " America are no more the ſubjects of the people " of Britain than the people of Yorkſhire are " the ſubjects of the people of Middleſex. " They are your *fellow-ſubjects.*" I am glad to hear, that they are ſubjects at all; and pray Doctor in what ſenſe are they fellow-ſubjects but in being ſubject to the ſame ſupreme legiſlature with ourſelves? In another ſenſe the French are our fellow-ſubjects; for the are ſubject to ſome legiſlature or other, and they are alſo our fellow-

men;

men; but certainly the coloniſts are not our fellow-ſubjects in the ſame ſenſe as the French.

The Doctor here again has recourſe to the figure *amphibologia*, or *double meaning*, by uſing terms ſuſceptible of various interpretation. When he ſays, "the coloniſts are not your ſubjects," if he means they are not the ſubjects of the Common Council of London, I perfectly agree with him, though ſome of the coloniſts have lately had the meanneſs to ſeek for a redreſs of grievances at that fountain, when the healing fountain was not above three miles farther, nay, I believe, was even three miles nearer. The terms *our* ſubjects, and *your* ſubjects, give nothing but confuſed ideas, and a clear reaſoner would have avoided them. The true queſtion ought to be, are coloniſts who go to ſettle on the remote dominions of the parent ſtate ſubject to the ſupreme legiſlature of that ſtate? But it ſerves the purpoſe of ſedition to jumble the ſubjection to the legiſlature, which is truly conſtitutional, with a ſubjection to individuals, which does not exiſt.

"But we are taxed, and why ſhould not they "be taxed?" ſo another queſtion our author ſuppoſes put to him, which he anſwers in the following manner. "You are taxed by your-"ſelves. They inſiſt on the ſame privilege." Here again the author continues at his buſh-fighting, and renders both his queſtion and anſwer ambiguous by uſing *we* and *they*, *you* and *yourſelves*, which may be interpreted variouſly.

The

The word *we*, according to the conſtitution, muſt ſtand for the King, Lords, and Commons of Great Britain in Parliament aſſembled, and the word *they* muſt import the ſubjects of that Parliament, our fellow-ſubjects in America. So that when he ſays, *they* inſiſt upon being *we*, it is the ſame thing as if he had ſaid, the ſubjects in America inſiſt upon being ſupreme legiſlators, otherwiſe they are ſlaves.

But notwithſtanding all the ignorant and factious aſſertions of Dr. Price, *not to poſſeſs the ſame, or an equal degree of liberty, can never be conſtrued into ſlavery.* Are there no degrees at all betwixt the rank and fortune of a lord and beggary? But what do I talk of beggary? Dr. Price tells us, that without liberty, that is, without a will in the ſupreme legiſlature, *man is a beaſt* *. He forgets, I ſuppoſe, that he is writing to men. May not I eſteem myſelf rich with a ſack-full of diamonds, without having one of the diamonds of the royal crown added to them? This caſe is preciſely applicable to the Britiſh coloniſts in America. They have all their ſack-full of diamonds when compared to every other dependent people on earth; but Meſſieurs Dickenſon, Hancock, and Adams, and Drs. Franklin and Price, have put it into their heads to whine and cry for one of the diamonds of the royal crown, which I ſuſpect they will cry long enough for, without ever obtaining it.

* Obſervations, page 95.

The Doctor again ſuppoſes the following objection made to him, " but they will not obey " the *Parliament* and the *laws*." He adviſes the objector to ſay rather, " they will not obey *your* " Parliament and *your* laws, becauſe they ſay they " have no voice in your Parliament, they have " no ſhare in making your laws." So then, upon Dr. Price's authority, all thoſe who have no voice in Parliament, I ſhall ſuppoſe he means, in forming the repreſentative part of it, need not obey its laws. Admirable doctrine! *The Parliament is not perfect*, THEREFORE *it has no* AUTHORITY, is a propoſition that will ever bring deſtruction upon thoſe who maintain it actively, till they get the majority of the nation to be of their opinion. The coloniſts, the Doctor ſays, have no ſhare in making the laws of the ſtate. What then? They have their ſhare in the benefit of thoſe laws. In no ſtate on this globe have all the ſubjects a ſhare in making the laws; and that has before been ſhewn to be founded on the very nature of man. It is the happineſs of the coloniſts that they can juſtly ſay the Britiſh Parliament is *their Parliament*, even in a more direct ſenſe than the Iriſh can; for they have ever ſince their firſt eſtabliſhment felt the benign influences of the direct rays of that Parliament more than the Iriſh, who have moſt impoliticaly been ſuffered to remain in the ſhade.

" If the coloniſts can ſubſiſt without you, " ſays the Doctor, is their aiming at indepen- " dence to be wondered at? Did their ever

" exiſt

" exiſt a community, or even an individual, " that would not do the ſame ?" This, I think, may very properly be called *ſedition direct*; and may with great eaſe be formed into the following proclamation. O ye, either communities or individuals, who find the laws inconvenient to you, Dr. Price aſſures you, it will not be wondered at, if you aim at an independence on thoſe laws. Moſt people, I fancy, will think that this ought to be proclaimed from ſome other high place than the pulpit. But in fact the caſe is too common to be any cauſe of wonder. There never exiſted an age when evil-doers were prodigies. Were there to be no evil-doers, there would not be the leaſt occaſion for any civil government; but God knowing that there would be many evil-doers upon earth, has ordained government. And government, expecting that there may be evil-minded perſons inclined to depend on the laws, only ſo far as they think fit, is ſuppoſed to be always ready prepared to puniſh them. What is the object of government but to make *the moſt happy, and the feweſt wretched*; therefore it is the general welfare, and not a partial welfare that government is to ſtudy, and when any ſmall part dare diſturb the public tranquility, they muſt expect the public reſentment for that attempt. Therefore to preach up the liberty of daring, without mentioning the conſequences of that daring, is truly a diabolical province, as weak minds may thereby be ſeduced into the commiſſion of the blackeſt of crimes.

The Doctor concludes his whole performance with the ſketch of a plan of pacification, propoſed in the Houſe of Lords by Lord Shelburne, which plan he adopts as his own, after beſtowing ſome encomiums both upon it and its author. I wiſh he had confined his encomiums to the author of the plan, and then he would probably have been ſeconded by every man of letters in Great Britain, as that Nobleman, with a ſpirit truly worthy of his rank, has ſhewn that he can diſtinguiſh and reward literary merit. I lament that the great talents of Lord Shelburne are not more directly employed in the ſervice of his country; but as to his plan, I find it altogether a leaky veſſel, that will not hold water. It is indeed held together by two imaginary hoops, which fall to pieces in the very attempt to examine them; and when theſe hoops are gone, the weakneſs of the whole becomes very evident.

The firſt propoſal it contains is, "Meet the "colonies on their own ground, in the laſt pe- "tition from the congreſs to the King; the "ſureſt as well as moſt dignified mode of pro- "ceeding for this country." Now to compare great things with ſmall, I ſhall illuſtrate that propoſition by a fact which lately happened in Great Britain. Within theſe two months a foreign veſſel was wrecked, or rather bulged on the weſtern coaſt of this iſland. The Juſtices of the peace, with ſome gentlemen of the neighbourhood, upon the firſt intelligence of the miſ-

fortune

fortune, went on board the veſſel to check the audacity of the mob, who might aſſemble to pillage. The crowd of pillagers was quickly very great, upon which the Juſtices read the riot act from the ſhip, and threatened them with the rigour of the law if they did not diſperſe. The rioters however were not to be put off ſo; they had conceived that they had a RIGHT to pillage, and inſtead of diſperſing, they began to argue the point with the Juſtices. Suppoſe they had withdrawn to ſome diſtance and choſen *delegates*, would it have been proper, would it have been conſtitutional for the Juſtices of the peace to have met thoſe delegates on *their own ground*, and to have deliberated on propoſitions offered from them?

To meet the rebels on the ground of a petition from the congreſs, what is it elſe but to begin with the confirmation of the direct violation of all their charters. No perſons ſitting at Philadelphia, have any more right to take upon themſelves the direction of the affairs of New-York, of Virginia, or of Carolina, than to direct the affairs of Spain or of Germany. New York is as independent on Penſylvania as on China; and Virginia has no more right to give law to Carolina than to Barbadoes or Jamaica. That the rebels are willing to have it ſo, will not alter the conſtitution of their charters; and their acting in direct oppoſition to thoſe charters is a manifeſt forfeiture of all of them. Are ſubjects who take upon them to redreſs their own grievances

grievances by force of arms, public enemies, or are they not? While ſuch ſubjects take upon them to oppoſe the will of the majority, the only claim they have, is a claim to the higheſt puniſhment. Their forming a ſyſtem among themſelves will not give them any rights. As the acts of the rebel coloniſts are an *ipſo facto* forfeiture of their charters, the firſt ground of a reſtoration of government and tranquility among them muſt be new charters granted by act of Parliament, and not an attention to any propoſitions from men who have no authority to make propoſitions. From what has been ſaid, my readers, I doubt not, will conclude, that the meeting the rebels on the ground of a petition from the congreſs, inſtead of being a ſure or dignified mode of proceeding, would, in fact, be a mode equally impolitic and diſhonourable.

The ſecond hoop of this plan is compoſed of as unſubſtantial materials as the firſt. "The "right of judging, it is ſaid, not only of the "*mode* of raiſing, but of the *quantum*, and the "appropriation of ſuch aids as they ſhall grant, "is among thoſe fundamental inalienable rights "of *Engliſhmen*, which no father can ſurrender "on the part of his ſon, no repreſentative on "the part of his elector, no generation on the part "of the ſucceeding one." All this but too evidently contradicts, not only the principles of the Britiſh conſtitution, but I believe of every conſtitution of civil government on earth, both ancient and modern. We have ſeen above in page 24, & ſeq.

the

the moſt plain and direct proofs from the Engliſh hiſtory, that public taxes in our ſtate have ever been obligatory upon the ſubject, and always under the direction of the executive power till the Revolution, when they became the objects of Parliamentary direction. But at no time were they under the direction of individuals; and indeed, it is contrary to the very nature of civil ſociety that they ſhould. To rank ſuch a right among the inalienable rights of human nature, is only a proof that the author has not ſcrutinized thoſe rights; for this right, ſo far from being inalienable, is always ſurrendered the moment a man becomes a member of civil ſociety. In Great Britain there is not a Lord, nor a member of the Houſe of Commons, that can ſay, he would not have been taxed, if he had not given his own conſent. How comes it then, that this inalienable right is found every where alienated? It is a demonſtration *ex abſurdo* that the propoſition is falſe.

Public taxes are nothing elſe but the general aid of the whole ſociety, for the defence of the ſociety, to be directed in the firſt inſtance by the legiſlative will, or legiſlative prudence, which is the all-pervading attracting power, that brings the force into coheſion and union, and is the firſt ſpring that gives it efficacy. This force would be no force at all, if every individual had a right to give only what degree of aid he thought proper, or in the words of the plan, were to judge, "*not* only of the *mode* of raiſing, but of the

"*quantum*

" *quantum* of ſuch aids as he grants." A block of Portland ſtone, when pounded, becomes nothing but white ſand: this ſand, by the means of glue may again be made to aſſume the form of the ſtone; but would it have the ſtrength of the ſtone? No: the principle of coheſion having been deſtroyed, it would, when put to the trial, prove nothing but ſand.

Did the free Romans leave it in the will of individuals to give to the ſtate, only what aids they thought proper? We find they did not. On the contrary; though they admitted none but *freemen* into their legions, thoſe freemen were in a manner always preſſed men, that is, when they were called out, they had not the right of refuſing. Thoſe among them who took upon themſelves to judge of the *mode* and *quantum* of their aids to the ſtate not only forfeited their property, but ſuffered corporal puniſhment; and in conſequence of refuſing pecuniary aids, they forfeited their *liberty* as well as their *property**.

The

* Qui ad nomina non reſpondiſſent, partim virgis cæſi, partim in vincula ducti. *Liv. lib.* 7.

Marcus Curius Conſul cum ſubitum delectum edicere coactus eſſet, Polliæ nomen urna extractum citari juſſit, neque eo reſpondente, bona adoleſcentis haſtæ ſubjecit. *Val. Max.*

Populus cum *vendit* eum, qui miles factus non eſt, non adimit ei libertatem, ſed judicat non eſſe eum liberum, qui ut liber ſit, adire periculum noluit. Cum autem incenſum vendit, hoc judicat, cum ii, qui in juſtâ ſervitute fuerint, cenſu liberentur, eum, qui cum liber eſſet, cenſeri noluerit, ipſum ſibi libertatem abjudicaviſſe.

The Gauls were ſtill more rigorous; for, with them, tardineſs in the public defence was death. Cæſar tells us, " hoc more Gallorum eſt initium belli, quo lege communi omnes puberes armati convenire coguntur; et qui ex iis noviſſimus venit in conſpectu multitudinis, omnibus cruciatibus necatur." That is, in the beginning of a war among the Gauls, all the youth capable of ſerving as ſoldiers, are, by a fundamental law, obliged to aſſemble in arms; and he that comes laſt to the rendezvous, is put to death by all manner of tortures, in preſence of the reſt.

It would ſeem that thoſe Gauls had no notion of the inalienable right of a ſubject to judge *how far*, or *in what manner* he ſhould aſſiſt the ſtate. Neither had the ancient Roman republicans any ſuch notion. Neither had the Engliſh nation any ſuch notion, till they began to miſapprehend their own conſtitution in the time of Charles I. as appears from the fulleſt evidence above produced in pages 26, 30, & ſeq. Some erroneous opinions, advanced in the beginning of the laſt century by party zealots, having been inadvertently adopted by Mr. Locke, the ſanction of his name, and of his authority, has made men of excellent underſtandings ab-

ſe. *Cic pro Cæcina.* Here we ſee that a free man, *qui noluit cenſeri*, who would not ſubmit to be taxed, was deemed to have abdicated his liberty, and to have made himſelf a ſlave; but according to the fine modern doctrine, with which the nation has been abuſed theſe twelve years, all who ſubmit to be taxed are ſlaves.

ſtain from applying their reaſon to the examination of thoſe propoſitions, which appear glaring abſurdities when candidly diſcuſſed. My regard for truth exceeds my veneration for Mr. Locke, and for all the great names in the world; and * therefore I endeavoured, two years ago, to point out the fallacy of his propoſition in regard to taxation, which has miſled thouſands to their ruin. That propoſitions of the ſame tendency have been again advanced in one of the moſt auguſt aſſemblies of the nation, by men of ſuperior abilities, is not much to be wondered at; for prejudices, however falſe and groundleſs, take ſome time to be diſpelled; and but too little attention has been beſtowed to give the point of RIGHT all that conſtitutional and hiſtorical proof of which it is ſuſceptible.

Errores ad ſua principia referre eſt refellere. To refer errors to their principles, is to refute errors; and ſuch has been my object in my preſent examination of Dr. Price's ſophiſtry. As he has taken the liberty, which our free conſtitution allows, of examining public meaſures, I have likewiſe taken the liberty of ſcrutinizing his opinions. The more I have ſifted his performance, the more I have found it to conſiſt of chaff. Bold aſſumptions, expreſſed in a petulant intemperate ſtyle, are almoſt in every page of it ſubſtituted for calm diſcuſſion and clear reaſoning. Throughout the whole, the poiſon of ſedition is diſtributed in very large doſes,

* *Rights of the Britiſh Legiſlature vindicated.*

which

which may have a moſt pernicious effect upon the unwary and over-credulous. I have therefore thought, that to expoſe the ſhallow artifices of the ſeducer, and to provide ſuch an antidote as may render his poiſon ineffectual, would be a ſervice both uſeful and acceptable to the public.

FINIS.

Publiſhed by the ſame Author.

I. A Comparative View of the Public Burdens of Great Britain and Ireland, with a Propoſal for putting both Iſlands on an Equality in regard to the Freedom of Foreign Trade.

II. An Eſſay concerning the Eſtabliſhment of a National Bank in Ireland.

III. Remarks on the New Eſſay of the Penſylvanian Farmer, and on the Reſolves and Inſtructions prefixed to that Eſſay.

IV. The Right of the Britiſh Legiſlature to tax the American Colonies vindicated; and the Means of aſſerting that Right propoſed. Second Edit.